THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

AUG 14 1959

Presented to
United
Theological Seminary
Library
Dayton, Ohio

by

Harold D. Halderman

THE

EXPOSITORY TIMES.

FOUNDED IN 1889 BY

JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

EDITED BY

A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.

AND

REV. E. HASTINGS, M.A.

VOLUME THE THIRTY-EIGHTH.

OCTOBER 1926–SEPTEMBER 1927

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
E 965
T582 42,403

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED,
FOR
T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON . . SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.
MANCHESTER . JOHN HEYWOOD.
EDINBURGH . . JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
GLASGOW . . JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
NEW YORK . . CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXXVIII.

AUTHORS.

Rev. Frank Ballard, D.D.— PAGE
Luke 17^{21} 331
Rev. Edward Beal—
The Unwritten Counterpart of the Gospels 475
Rev. J. Beveridge, M.B.E., B.D.—
Recent Foreign Theology 423
Rev. P. J. Beveridge, B.D., B.Sc.—
The Doctrine of the Atonement . . 516
Rev. B. Vernon Bird—
Broadcasting in Old Testament Times . 69
Rev. J. R. Birtle—
Psalm 20^{7} 234
Rev. D. Browne, B.D.—
Who was Nathanael? 286
J. Davies Bryan—
Cross-Bearing 378
Rev. Leslie H. Bunn, B.A.—
The Parable of the Tares 561
Professor F. C. Burkitt, F.B.A., D.D.—
The Baptism of Jesus 198
R. Burn—
Conjectures on Some Minor Prophets . 377
Professor C. J. Cadoux, M.A., D.D.—
Judaism and Universalism in the Gospels 55, 136
Rev. J. Connor, B.A., B.D.—
Matthew 5^{18} 469
Rev. T. Cottam—
Some Displacements in the Fourth Gospel 91
Professor W. A. Curtis, D.D., D.Litt.—
The Parable of the Labourers . . . 6
Rev. F. A. Farley—
Jeremiah and 'The Suffering Servant of Jehovah' in Deutero-Isaiah . . . 521
Rev. H. J. Flowers, B.D.—
Paul's Prayer for the Ephesians . . 227
Rev. R. S. Franks, M.A., D.Litt.—
The Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican 373
Rev. H. W. Fulford—
James 2^{1} 469
Professor W. Fulton, D.D., B.Sc.—
The Index Volume of the Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics 355
Professor Percy Gardner, Litt.D.—
Present-Day Faiths—Modernism in the English Church 247
Principal A. E. Garvie, D.D.— PAGE
Recent Foreign Theology . 91, 236, 372, 554
The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit . . 484
Rev. Norman Goodall, M.A.—
Virginibus Puerisque 79
Rev. T. C. Gordon, D.F.C., B.D.—
Virginibus Puerisque 171
Baha'ism and Christianity 325
Rev. A. J. Gossip, M.A.—
Virginibus Puerisque . 28, 78, 122, 170, 218, 270, 313, 360, 407, 458, 506, 543
Rev. Frank J. Gould, A.T.S.—
Virginibus Puerisque 409
Rev. Alex. Grieve, D.Phil.—
Recent Foreign Theology . . . 186, 282
Edward Grubb, M.A.—
Present-Day Faiths—The Society of Friends 213
Professor Hermann Gunkel—
The 'Historical Movement' in the Study of Religion 532
J. Rendel Harris, Litt.D., LL.D., D.D.—
The Early Christian Interpretation of the Passover 88
A Mediæval Interpretation of John 13^{1} . 233
A Lost Verse of St. John's Gospel . . 342
Rev. A. W. Harrison, M.C., B.Sc., D.D.—
Present-Day Faiths—Methodism . . 416
Rev. H. Highfield, M.A.—
Gleanings from the Septuagint . . . 44
ἀγαπάω and φιλέω 525
C. F. Hogg—
Note on ἀγαπάω and φιλέω . . . 379
Rev. James T. Hudson, B.A., B.D.—
A Disarrangement in John 10 . . . 329
Virginibus Puerisque 506
Very Rev. W. R. Inge, D.D.—
'Private Vices' and 'Public Benefits' . 21
Rev. J. W. Jack, M.A.—
Samaria in Ahab's Time: Harvard Excavations and their Results . . . 264
Recent Foreign Theology 332
S. Langdon, M.A.—
Recent Excavations in Mesopotamia, 1918–26 70
Rev. R. E. Lee, B.D., M.C.—
John 6^{29-31} 188
Luke 22^{32} 233
Rev. John Lendrum, M.A.—
'Greater Things than These' 471

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PAGE

Rev. F. W. Lewis, M.A.—
The Arrangement of the Texts in the Third Chapter of St. John . . . 92
Luke 17^{21} 187

Rev. J. P. Lilley, D.D.—
Francis of Assisi 38

Professor J. E. McFadyen, D.D.—
Recent Foreign Theology 25, 184, 234, 281, 371, 420, 518

Professor J. F. McFadyen, D.D.—
Recent Foreign Theology 235

Rev. A. H. McNeile, D.D.—
The Holy Spirit in the Individual . 552

Professor W. M. Macgregor, D.D.—
The Parable of the Two Sons . . . 498

Professor J. R. Mackay, D.D.—
Indignor quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus 380

Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.Phil., D.D.—
Recent Foreign Theology . . . 23, 369

Professor A. Main, D.Litt., D.D.—
Present-Day Faiths—Presbyterianism . 501

Professor D. S. Margoliouth, D.Litt.—
The Visit to the Tomb 278

Rev. E. J. Martin, D.D.—
The Transfiguration 189

Rev. D. Matheson, M.A.—
Cross-bearing 188, 524

Rev. W. J. May—
Virginibus Puerisque 314

Rev. H. G. Meecham, M.A., B.D.—
Luke 7^{47} 286

Rev. S. H. Mellone, M.A., D.Sc.—
Present-Day Faiths—Unitarian Christianity 358

Professor N. Micklem, M.A.—
Present-Day Faiths—Congregationalism. 167

Rev. C. N. Moody, M.A.—
Spiritual Power in Pagan Religions and in the Old Testament 180
Spiritual Power in Later Judaism and in the New Testament 557

Rev. W. D. Morris—
1 Peter 3^{19} 470

Rev. J. O. F. Murray, D.D.—
The Messiahship of Jesus . . 343, 401, 439

Rev. Cecil Nicholson—
Virginibus Puerisque 123, 544

Rev. T. Nicklin—
James 2^{1} 330
St. Mark 16^{8} 429

Professor W. D. Niven, M.A.—
Recent Foreign Theology . . . 283, 372

Rev. E. G. Norris—
James 2^{1} 469

Professor W. P. Paterson, D.D.—
The Parables of the Treasure and the Pearl 261, 295

Rev. Herbert Pegg— PAGE
'A Scorpion for an Egg' 468

Professor Hubert Pernot—
Greek and the Gospels 103

C. A. Phillips, M.A.—
A Mediæval Interpretation of John 13^{1} . 233

Harry Pirie-Gordon, M.A.—
The Reduction of Gideon's Army . . 284

Rev. F. J. Rae, M.A.—
A New Idea in Religious Education . . 133

Rev. W. H. Rigg, D.D.—
Present-Day Faiths—Evangelicalism within the Church of England . . 309

Professor J. A. Robertson, D.D.—
The Parable of the Unjust Judge . . 389

Rev. Stuart Robertson, M.A.—
Virginibus Puerisque 271, 361

Principal H. Wheeler Robinson, M.A., D.D.—
Present-Day Faiths—The Faith of the Baptists 451

Rev. H. H. Rowley—
The 'Chaldæans' in the Book of Daniel . 423

Rev. Prebendary Melville Scott, D.D.—
Isaiah 7^{8} 525

R. B. Y. Scott, M.A.—
Who was Nathanael? 93

Rev. Douglas S. Sharp, M.A., B.D.—
St. Mark 2^{10} 428

Professor J. M. Shaw, D.D.—
The Rest of the Future Life . . . 405

Rev. V. D. Siddons—
Obadiah 5 331

Principal Israel W. Slotki—
Genesis 4^{7}, and a Form of Hebrew Poetry 329

Professor Judah J. Slotki, B.A.—
Beth-Horon (Jos. 10^{11}) 188

F. Herbert Stead, M.A.—
The Idea of God in the Psalms, ii. . . 18

Rev. J. E. Stewart, M.A.—
Virginibus Puerisque 459

Rev. R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc.—
Recent Foreign Theology . . . 473, 520

Rev. R. Strong, M.A., B.Litt—
Virginibus Puerisque 29, 218

Emeritus Principal J. G. Tasker, D.D.—
Recent Foreign Theology 333

Rev. P. Thomson, D.D.—
Ἐπιστρέφω 468

Rev. W. S. Thomson—
Tongues at Pentecost (Acts 2) . . . 284

Professor A. C. Welch, D.D., D.Th.—
Psalm 81: A Sidelight into the Religion of North Israel 455

Rev. H. A. Williamson, B.D.—
Interpretation of 2 Kings $8^{10.11}$ . . 379

Rev. C. J. Wright, B.D.—
Some Tendencies and Problems in Modern Theology 150

SUBJECTS.

	PAGE
America, Religious Life of	97
'Amorite' Empire	25
Anthropomorphism	194
Apocalyptic Conception of Life	291
Atonement	481, 516
Autosuggestion	437
Baha'ism and Christianity	325
Baptism of Jesus	198
Baptists, Faith of	451
Belief in God	293
Beth-Horon	188
Bible, Infallibility	52
Boredom	431
Broadcasting in O.T. Times	69
Brotherhood	528
Catholicism	3
'Chaldæans' in Daniel	423
Christ, Call of	175
,, Call to Rest	174
,, Doctrine of	340
,, the Lamb of God	323
,, and the O.T.	337
,, Personal Work	23
,, Portraits of	386
,, Presence of	274
,, Product of Time	172
,, Promise	436
,, Putting on	528
,, the Rock	125
,, the Secret Guest	130
,, To-day	45
,, Tomb	278
,, Unique Son of God	246
,, the Way	86
Christian, Reasons for being	335
Christianity, Indian	94
,, Influence on Literature	480
Church	483
,, and Science	385
Comfort of Man	126
Congregationalism	167
Contemplation	191
Convictions	429
Cross-bearing	188, 378, 524
Decalogue	387
Deity, Nature of	339
Divine Uplifting	141
Elim	220
Emergent Evolution	49
Eternity	147, 462
Evangelicalism in the Church of England	309
Evolution	1, 101
Excavation	70, 264
Experience	383
Faith	100
,, Coercive Element in	246
,, Last Stand of	33
,, and Modern Knowledge	341
,, and Works	437
Fall	290
Fear in the Night	82
Foreign Theology	23, 91, 184, 234, 281, 332, 369, 420, 473, 518, 554
Fourth Gospel, Displacements	91
Francis of Assisi	38
Friendship of Christ	464
Fruitfulness	513
Fundamentalism	101, 151
Future Life	147, 529
,, ,, Rest in	405
Genesis Stories	289
Gideon's Army, Reduction of	284
God, Indwelling	430
,, in the Psalms	18
God's Honour, Pledge of	367
Gospel, Simple	51
Gospels, Unwritten Counterpart of	475
Greek and the Gospels	103
Greenwell, Dora	287
Growth, Spiritual	80
Historical Evidence, Disregard of	531
Holy Spirit in the Church	195
,, ,, Doctrine of	435, 484
,, ,, in the Individual	552
Humility	288
Image-worship	388
Immanence and Transcendence	101
Immortality	147, 405, 529, 564
Incarnation	49
,, and Human Life	84
Individualism and Co-operation	190
Institutionalism, Christian	3
Israel, Religion of North	455
Jahweh, 'Demonic' Element	26
Jeremiah and the Suffering Servant	521
Jerusalem	479
Jesus, Judaism of	57
,, Manliness of	222
,, Messiahship	244, 343, 401, 439
,, Originality	338
,, Supremacy of	95
,, the Teacher	192
,, Universalism of	136
Jewish Particularism	56
,, Universalism	55
Job	438
John's Gospel, Lost Verse of	342
Joy and Sacrifice	316
Judaism	433
,, of Jesus	57
,, and Universalism	55, 136
Knowledge, Enlarging	366
Liberal Judaism	433
Life, An Attitude to	132
,, Expanding	414
,, Mirror of Infinite Life	194
,, New	409
Literature, Influence of Christianity on	480
Love	411
,, Supremacy of	224
Macedonia, Call from	461
Man and Apes	2
,, Relation to God and Universe	197
Marana tha	244
Mesopotamia, Recent Excavations in	70
Methodism	416
Minor Prophets, Conjectures on	377
Missions, Chinese	335
Modernism	152, 247
Nathanael	93, 286
Nature Worship	4
Necessities	95
New Psychology	145
Paganism, Spiritual Power in	180
Palestine, Economic Conditions of	291
Parable of the Labourers	6
,, ,, Pharisee and the Publican	373
,, ,, Tares	561
,, ,, Treasure and the Pearl	261, 295
,, ,, Two Sons	380, 498
,, ,, Unjust Judge	389
Passover, Early Christian Interpretation	88
Patriarchs, Ages of	45
Perfection, Doctrine of Christian	294
Personality	46
,, Human, Development of	2
,, Respect for	46
Philosophy	4, 49
Prayer	194, 364, 385
Prayers, Pagan	180
Preaching	51, 381
Presbyterianism	501
'Private Vices' and 'Public Benefits'	21
Progress	3
Project Principle	133
Property	388
Protestantism	3
Psalms, Idea of God in	18
Reconstruction	23
Religion	4
,, Historical Movement	532
,, Historical and Supra-historical	554
,, Present-day	293, 482
,, and Science	1
,, of the Spirit	4
Religious Education, New Idea in	133
Religious Experience	99
Resistances, Beneficent	35
Rest	514
,, in Future Life	405
Resurrection, Gospel of	317
Sacraments	149
Sâdhu Sundar Singh	191, 527
Samaria in Ahab's Time	264
Self-reliance	100
Septuagint Gleanings	44
Society of Friends	213
Spirit, Doctrine of	435
Spiritual Power in Pagan Religions	180
,, ,, in Later Judaism and in the N.T.	557
Suffering	431
,, in the N.T.	194
,, in the O.T.	26
Supreme Self	339
Temple Cleansing	91, 92
Theology	4
,, and Life	53
,, Modern	150

	PAGE
Thomas	321
Tongues at Pentecost	284
Torah of Jahweh	145
Transfiguration	189
Unitarianism	358
Virginibus Puerisque	28, 78, 122, 170, 218, 270, 313, 360, 407, 458, 506, 543
Vision	480
War	37
Women, Ministry of	382
Words, Living	219
Work	238
Worship	478, 484

BOOKS.

	PAGE
Alington, Elementary Christianity	306
Allen, Methodism	62
Allwohn, Die Ehe des Propheten Hosea	282
Annett, The Hidden Centuries	306, 384
Ballard, Christian Findings	305
Barton, Immortality	565
Bauer, Die Ostkanaanäer	25
Baumgartner, Das Buch Daniel	27
Beckmann, Vom Sakrament bei Calvin	370
Bertholet, History of Hebrew Civilization	301
Alfred Bertrand	113
Bevan, The Apocalypse	400
Bird, Psalms, 2 vols.	444
Blackburn, Invincible Love	163
Blyth, When We Lived in Jerusalem	479
Bonner, Romance of English Bible	449
Boreham, Tuft of Comet's Hair	47
Bosanquet, Science and Philosophy	396
Bowhay, Life and Man	256
Braham, Personality and Immortality	113
Brailsford, James Nayler	539
Bready, Lord Shaftesbury	255
Brown, Acts	67
,, Eternity	147
Browne, From Babylon to Bethlehem	162
Brun, Jesu Evangelium	423
Budge, Cleopatra's Needles	112
Bugbee, Christ To-day	45
Bulmerincq, Der Prophet Maleachi	281
Bunyan, Holy War, ed. W. H. Draper	211
Burch, Myth and Constantine	302
,, Jesus Christ	447
Burton, Christianity in the Modern World	335
Cadman, Imagination and Religion	66
Cambridge Medieval History, v.	300
Campbell, Thomas Arnold	446
Canton, Yesterday, To-day, and For Ever	240
Cardinall, In Ashanti and Beyond	303
Carmichael, Raj	120
Carstairs, Shepherd of Udaipur	301
Carter, Anglican 'Via Media'	302
Chakkarai, Jesus the Avatār	494
Chalmers, Further Dialogues of the Buddha	259
Chisholm, High Roads	118
Church of England and Free Churches	210
Clayton, The Smoking Furnace	496
Coffin, Portraits of Jesus Christ	307
Coffin, What to Preach	380
Confirmation	14
Cooke, Did Paul Know of the Virgin Birth?	353
Curtois, Conversion of the English	498
Danby, The Jew and Christianity	493
Dawson-Walker, Colossians and Titus	67
,, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude	307
Deane, Thomas Cranmer	398
Deissmann, Paul, second edition	491
Dibelius, Geschichtliche und übergeschichtliche Religion	554
Dimond, Psychology of Methodist Revival	159
Drown, Religion or God?	447
Duncan-Jones, Archbishop Laud	445
Elbogen, History of the Jews	166
E.R.E. Index	287, 355
Essays Catholic and Critical	10
Eternal Spirit	195
Eusebius, i., tr. Lawlor and Oulton	498
Farrow, Faith, Fancies, and Fetich	121
Faye, Origen	160
Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann	421
,, ,, Adolf Jülicher	520
Fife, Savage Life in the Black Sudan	351
Finkelstein, David Kimhi on Isaiah	448
Flowers, Ten Commandments	387
Foakes-Jackson, Life of St. Paul	348
Fosdick, Adventurous Religion	336
,, Spiritual Values	564
Fraser, The New Africa	530
Future of Christianity	340, 349
Future of the Church of England	202
Gardner, Modernism in the English Church	254
Gardner-Smith, Narratives of the Resurrection	205
Garvie, Preachers of the Church	50
Gautier, Études sur la Religion d'Israël	422
Geden, Evangel of Hebrew Prophets	14
Glaister, Beauty of the Lord	209
Glover, Saturday Papers	430
Goodspeed, Formation of N.T.	256
,, E. de. W. Burton	308
Gordon, My Education and Religion	110
Gore, Can We then Believe?	4, 12
Gossip, Galilean Accent	252
Gowing, J. E. Watts-Ditchfield	305
Goyau, Cardinal Mercier	209
Graham, Divinity in Man	349
Grant, Bible of Jesus	337
,, Economic Background of the Gospels	291
Gray, With Christ as Guide	528
Grenfell, What Christ Means to Me	238
Griffith-Jones, Dominion of Man	197
Grubb, Christianity as Life	531, 537
Haitjema, Karl Barth's 'Kritische' Theologie	473
Harris, Twenty-sixth Ode of Solomon	67
Harrison, Beginnings of Arminianism	303
Hasluck, Letters on Religion and Folklore	351
Headlam, New Prayer Book	396
Hebrew O.T.	156
Heiler, Spirit of Worship	155
,, Sâdhu Sundar Singh	527
Herman, Touch of God	141
Hertz, Affirmations of Judaism	433
Herzog, Weisheit im Staube	281
Höffding, Spinoza's Ethica	283
Hogarth, Kings of the Hittites	210
Holland, The Indian Outlook	257
Honor, Sennacherib's Invasion of Palestine	395
Horton, Capacity for God	99
Hoyland, Faith and History	68
Hudson, ABC of Christian Living	450
Hügel, Philosophy of Religion	257
Hutton, Thomas Becket	165
,, Dark Mile	189
,, Guidance from Francis Thompson	207
,, Tragedy of Saul	258
,, John Wesley	398
Inge, Platonic Tradition	3
James, Creation Stories of Genesis	289
Jefferson, Cardinal Ideas of Isaiah	306
Jones, Finding the Trail of Life	64
,, Christ of the Indian Road	94

	PAGE
Jones, Watching the Cross	117
Jordan, History and Revelation	112
Joynt, Life of St. Gall	354
Kerr, Gospel in Modern Poetry	239
Kiek, Modern Religious Situation	253
,, Child Nature	399
Kirk, Conscience	490
König, Das Buch Jesaja	520
Krishnamurti, Kingdom of Happiness	493
Kuhn, Erklärung des Buches Koheleth	27
Lacey, Anglo-Catholic Faith	255
Laun, Soziales Christentum in England	236
Leckie, Secession Memories	61
Legrain, Culture of the Babylonians	490
,, Royal Inscriptions from Nippur and Babylon	491
Levison, The Parables	254
Lockton, Three Traditions in the Gospels	209
Lodge, Science and Human Progress	395
Loewe, Mediæval Hebrew Minstrelsy	252
M'Comb, Preaching in Theory and Practice	164
M'Connell, Christlike God	447
McFadyen, Approach to the O.T.	109
,, Missionary Idea in Life and Religion	300
,, Guide to Understanding of O.T.	394
Mackenzie, Christ the King	450
Mackintosh, Christian Experience of Forgiveness	489
Maclean, Law of the Lord's Day	114
McNeile, Introduction to the Study of the N.T.	489
MacPhail, Aśoka	119
Macpherson, Church and Science	385
Martin, Jonah	66
,, Christ and Money	213
Marty, Les chapitres 55–66 du livre d'Esaie	332
Massam, Cliff Dwellers of Kenya	351
Mehlis, Quest for God	482
Meinhold, Der Dekalog	519
Mellone, The Apocrypha	495
Micklem, Systematic Theology	304
Mills, The Ao Nagas	111
Moffatt, Expositor's Year Book	117
,, Golden Book of Tillotson	206
Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, second editon, 2 vols.	444
Morgan, Nature and Right of Religion	299
Morris, Man Created during Descent	210
Moulton, R. G. Moulton	116
Mozley, Impassibility of God	63
Müller-Schwefe, Moderner Katholizismus	235
Murphy, Primitive Man	497
Murray, The Hereafter	353
Murry, Life of Jesus	108
Mursell, Bishop's Boots	116
Nicoll, Seen and Unseen	142
Nock, Sallustius	161
Norwood, Gospel of Larger World	117
Oesterley, Tractate Shabbath	401
Orchard, Foundations of Faith, iv.	529
Otto, Das Heilige	24, 438
Owst, Preaching in Medieval England	13
Palestine Exploration Fund Annual, 1923–25	497
Pallis, Babylonian Akitu Festival	204
,, St. John and the Apocalypse	258
,, Mandæan Studies	354
Patton, Fundamental Christianity	62
Paul: the Jew	493
Pavry, Zoroastrian Doctrine of Future Life	119
Pedersen, Israel	13
Peers, Studies of the Spanish Mystics	350
Perkins, Doctrine of Christian Perfection	294
Plater and White, Grammar of Vulgate	114
Povah, The O.T. and Modern Problems	145
Powicke, Cambridge Platonists	157
,, Richard Baxter	394
Preiss and Rohrbach, Palestine and Transjordania	166
Rade, Glaubenslehre	23
Radhakrishnan, Hindu View of Life	251
,, Indian Philosophy, ii.	494
Raven, Creator Spirit	445
Rawlinson, Mark	110
,, N.T. Doctrine of Christ	243
Raymond, Early Church and Wine	538
Rhinelander, Think Out Your Faith	209
Rigg, 1 and 2 Samuel	67
Rihbany, Seven Days with God	492
Robertson, Studies in the Text of the N.T.	258
Robinson, Outline Introduction to History of Religions	61
,, The Cross of the Servant	253
,, Excluded Books of the N.T.	359
Rorke, In Search of a Personal Creed	429
Ross, Christian Worship	478
Schaeffer, Prophetic Service	259
Schenkel, Der Protestantismus der Gegenwart	333
Schmidt, Die Thronfahrt Jahves	421
,, Zeit und Ewigkeit	473
Schmidt-Japing, Die Christologischen Anschauungen	473
Schmitz, Die Bedeutung des Wortes bei Paulus	475
Schofield, Retreats	354
,, Gospel of Opportunity	396
Scott, First Age of Christianity	64
Christ, Sin and Redemption	115
,, Christianity according to Paul	348
,, The Church	483
Selbie, Theology and Modern Man	212
Sellin, Baudissin	185
Shepherd, Humanism of Jesus	161
Simpson, Archbishop Bramhall	259
Singh, Visions of the Spiritual World	191
Slattery, Words from His Throne	449
Smith, The Psalms	63
,, Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar	158
Smyth, Myself	65
Soper, What may I Believe?	396
Souter, Earliest Latin Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul	494
Speaker's Bible	141
Stephanus, Bishop Wilfrid	397
Stewart, Music in Church Worship	208
,, Crucifixion	567
Stockholm Conference	165
Street, Individualism and Individuality	354
Streeter, Reality	193
Stuart, Evolution in Religion	260
Study Bible	256
Temple, Essays in Christian Politics	436
Theology and Life	53
Thomson, Man in Light of Evolution	1
Titinis, Natur und Gott	91
Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society	15
Traub, Glaube und Geschichte	369
Turner, Nature of Deity	339
Tyndall, Through Science to God	354
Valentine, Modern Psychology	158
Volz, Das Dämonische in Jahwe	26
Wales, Hebrews	67
Ward, Essays in Philosophy	537
Warr, Principal Caird	60
Warschauer, Historical Life of Christ	386, 393
Watson, Church at Work	61

	PAGE
Ways of Living	190
Webb, Kant's Philosophy of Religion	203
Wehrung, Schleiermacher	475
Weizsäcker, Seelenbehandlung	282
Welldon, The English Church	202
Werdermann, Das religiöse Angesicht Amerikas	97
Whitehead, Religion in the Making	256
Williams, Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin	491
Wishart, The Fact of Prayer	450
Wolf, Oldest Biography of Spinoza	351
Woodlock, Modernism	209
Worcester, Was Jesus an Historical Person?	398
Workman, John Wyclif	206
Yardley, Was Christ really Born of a Virgin?	204
Yates, Strategies of Grace	118
Zieliński, Religion of Ancient Greece	157

HEBREW WORDS.

	PAGE
אמלל (Na 1[4])	378[a]
בקרים (Am 6[12])	377
חמבלינ (Am 5[9])	377[b]
העגלה (Am 2[13])	377[a]
העב (Na 2[5])	378[a]
הרות (Am 1[13])	377[a]
חַיְתוֹ	267[b]
חרר	188
חֲרֵשׁ	266[a]
יזכר (Na 2[6])	378[a]
נְזָכִיר (Ps 20[7])	234
נִצָּבִים	269
עֵד־בְּנֵשׁ (2 K 8[11])	379[b]
צַל־הַנְּחִתִית	456[b]
ראש (Is 7[8])	526[a]

GREEK WORDS.

	PAGE
ἀγαπάω and φιλέω	44, 379, 525
βαστάζω	104, 188, 378, 524
ἐπιστρέφω	234, 468
ἵνα	104, 428
μεταμέλεσθαι and μετανοεῖν	44
οὐ χάριν	286
πάσχα and πάσχω	89
σταυρός	188, 378, 524
ὕπαγε	107

TEXTS.

	PAGE
Gn iv. 7	329
xxxvii. 3, 4	44
xl. 7, 8	272
Ex xv. 27	220
Dt iii. 24	432
xviii. 15	244
Jos x. 11	188
1 S ix. 7–10	122
2 K vi. 30	412
viii. 10, 11	379
Neh ix. 20	360
Job xxxviii. 1	439
Ps xvii. 5	170
xix. 3, 4	543
xx. 7	234
lv. 6	171
lxxiii, 16, 17	550
lxxxi.	455
ciii. 13	288
cxix. 18	218
cxix. 32	78
Pr iii. 6	178
iv. 14, 15	409
xi. 3	361
Ec iii. 11	462
ix. 4	123
Song ii. 1	544
iii. 8	82
Is ii. 4	37
vii. 8	525
xxviii. 16	125
xxxii. 2	126
xxxv. 7	511
xlii. 16	313
liii. 2	172
Jer xvii. 9	290
La ii. 22	479
Ezk xvi. 4	480
Dn iii. 16–18	33
Hos vi. 3	366
Am iv. 12	241
Am vi. 1	45
viii. 8	242
Obad v.	331
xvii.	47
Mal iii. 17	506
Mt iii. 11	107
v. 18	469
vii. 7	364
vii. 8	544
vii. 20	513
xii. 19, 20	362
xii. 28	435
xiii. 24–30, 36–43	561
xiii. 44–46	261, 295
xvi. 18	483
xvii. 20	123
xviii. 20	177
xx. 1–16	6
xx. 23	508
xxi. 19	192
xxi. 28–31	498
xxii. 12	32
xxii. 40	411
xxii. 42	340
xxv. 15	29
xxviii. 1	279
Mk i. 7, 8	107
i. 17	414
ii. 10	106, 428
iii. 4	104
iv. 11, 12	104
vi. 31	174, 514
vii. 24	130
viii. 29	443
ix. 24	132
xiv. 9	226
xiv. 65	105
xvi. 1	279
xvi. 8	429
Lk ii. 1	128
iii. 16	107
Lk iii. 22	198
iv. 18	435
vii. 47	286
viii. 33	506
xi. 12	468
xiv. 23	105
xv. 18	28
xvi. 18	288
xvii. 21	187, 331
xviii. 1–8	389
xviii. 9–14	373
xxi. 4	96
xxii. 32	233, 468
xxiii. 26	567
Jn i. 14	219
i. 29	323
i. 41	443
i. 50	471
iii.	92
iii. 13–16	91
iii. 14–21	92
iii. 16	4
iii. 31–36	91
v. 1	91, 92
v. 20	471
vi. 9	276
vi. 29–31	188
vii. 37	409
vii. 53–viii. 11	91
x. 7–11	329
x. 24	105
xi. 25	440
xiii. 1	233
xiv. 6	86
xiv. 12	471
xv. 12	319
xv. 15	464
xvi. 33	222
xvii. 1, 2	105
xx. 25	321
xxi. 15–17	44
Ac ii.	284
ii. 46	124
v. 2	458
v. 30, 31	317
ix. 6	175
xv.	436
xvi. 9, 10	461
Ro vi. 23	466
vii. 7	436
viii. 22	459
1 Co i. 24	245
vi. 11	407
xiii. 13	224
xv. 45	84
xvi. 22	244
2 Co i. 22	367
iii. 17	545
v. 5	567
vi. 4	95
ix. 7	124
Gal iv. 7	548
vi. 17	277
Eph i. 15–23	227
v. 14	274
Ph i. 12	35
iii. 2	271
iv. 8, 11	438
Col i. 9, 10	80
i. 15–18	245
1 Th v. 18	547
2 Ti i. 6	79
He vii. 25	288
xi. 33, 34	31
xii. 2	316
Ja ii. 1	330, 469
iv. 1	21
v. 3	270
1 P iii. 19	470
1 Jn iv. 7	528
Rev xxi. 13	510
xxi. 27	128

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Probably few people who habitually use the word Evolution as part of their working vocabulary could define the term in a way that would satisfy a scientist, and there are probably nearly as few who have read Darwin's 'Origin of Species.' That epoch-making book was published sixty-seven years ago, and directly or indirectly it has profoundly affected every department of research and thought; yet it may be questioned whether its ideas have really percolated into the popular mind.

The idea of evolution entertained by most unscientific persons is summarily expressed in the phrase that 'man has sprung from the monkey'—to which a cynical wit once added, 'And some men have not sprung very far.' Now, against this shallow and misleading view of evolution, Professor J. Arthur Thomson lifts up his voice in protest in the Essex Hall Lecture which he delivered this year on *Man in the Light of Evolution* (Lindsey Press; 1s. 6d. net). When we envisage the sifting-out process by which man has come to be what he is, this view is not only shallow and misleading; it is, he says, a view of 'unutterable vulgarity.'

Now it behoves us to give careful heed to anything Professor Thomson may say on such a matter. We do not know whether he would care to be considered as a preacher, but he is without doubt one of the most effective preachers of our time. Through his books, his articles, and his lectures he addresses a constituency which the most eloquent preacher might well envy, and he does his readers or hearers the invaluable service of keeping them in touch with the wonder, and, shall we say, the Divinity of the world. He is preacher and poet, almost as much as he is scientist; and, though he would be the last man to claim finality for his pronouncements, in him the old quarrel between Science and Religion is laid to rest. His religion may not be the dogmatic religion of the Churches, but it is a religion that would have won the approval of the writer of the thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth chapters of the Book of Job.

This question of the relation of Religion and Science is very much in the air just now. Only a few months ago a striking book on 'Science, Religion, and Reality' was reviewed in these columns; and it is interesting to note the points of contact between that book and Professor Thomson's. Apart from the general similarity of outlook and spirit, there is a curious correspondence of detail in the reference each book makes to Newton. Each has occasion to emphasize the fact that, in the consideration of evolution, attention should be as earnestly concentrated on the issue as on the origin of a process. Professor Thomson remarks, 'Who thinks less of Newton because he was once a peculiarly miserable infant'? Dean Inge, in the concluding essay of

the longer book, gives a witty turn to this by remarking that 'it tells us nothing about Newton to know that he once had a tail.'

The relationship of man to the anthropoid apes is a real one, but it is not a relationship of descent. Professor THOMSON is concerned to rebut this vulgar error, and twice, in varying language, he makes it clear, to those who entertain this common but erroneous idea, that 'no living ape is ever thought of as man's ancestor.' The truth is that the highest apes are only man's 'collaterals on another branch of the genealogical tree.' There was first the Primate stem which two or three million years ago sent out its first tentative branches, with a resulting 'tangle of monkeys.' The monkeys diverged, but the main stem grew on. Giving off first the lower, then the higher anthropoid apes, it still grew on. More branches were given off—tentative man eventually; till at last came Homo, and even within his species the same sifting went on.

Nor is the process over. Evolution is still going on, as is evidenced, among other things, by the number of races within the species of *homo sapiens*; and even in the bodily structure of man, though there are no startling changes, variations are continually cropping up. Some vestigial relics are disappearing from his body, and 'it is not unlikely that deep constitutional changes are in progress, changes in the shape of life's trajectory, perhaps correlated with changes in the ductless glands.' It is an amazing process, moving without haste, without rest, down the countless ages, and well calculated to rouse a feeling of awe at the contemplation of the creature who is the product—though it would never be quite correct to say the finished product—of it all.

But man, the final if not the finished product, is so wonderful that even a convinced evolutionist like Alfred Russel Wallace feels constrained to postulate for him some 'spiritual influx,' some origin, distinct from that which accounts for his animal characteristics, whether of body or mind. This is an honourable inconsistency, due to a recognition of the real 'apartness' of man, a clear recognition of the undeniable fact that he is in a deep sense a new creation.

But, deeply as Professor THOMSON respects Wallace, he will not allow that his view on this point is sound. For from two antecedents, such as oxygen and hydrogen, there may arise an entirely new synthesis, such as water, a synthesis with properties entirely unpredictable on the basis of even the most accurate knowledge of its constituent elements. And so, Professor THOMSON believes, it is with man. The circumstance that we cannot describe all the factors in the process of his evolution does not give us the right to postulate a spiritual influx: that would be tantamount to the introduction of a factor which might fairly be described as alien, or at any rate external, to account for facts which the scientific man must believe to be ultimately capable of a scientific explanation.

Thus, though man is a vital new creation, the consistent evolutionist will refuse to admit that the emergence of his distinctive qualities involves any breach of continuity, and this continuous unbroken process is just as capable of a religious interpretation as would be a process interrupted at special points by intrusions from without, which seemed to postulate for their explanation a special Divine intervention. Indeed there are many minds, even among those which have no particular scientific training, to which such an unbroken continuous process would be religiously more impressive than an interrupted one. At any rate, we must begin to familiarize ourselves with the idea that, after all, there may be no 'gaps.'

Professor THOMSON is undoubtedly right when he suggests that the resentment of the evolutionary doctrine, where it is resented, is due to the fact that it seems to compromise or impoverish the dignity and uniqueness of man. But surely he is equally right in arguing that the very reverse of

this is the case. The creature who crowns so long and stupendous a movement must be impressive indeed. 'What origin could be more dignified than the long Ascent that led to Man!' 'Origin does not affect value'—that is well said and worth saying, especially worth saying to those who tend to forget the end in the beginning.

And the end is not yet. It doth not yet appear what we shall be. But in view of what man has already become out of beginnings so unpromising, 'there is no thinkable end to the evolution of Human Personality. Where this evolution of the Personality may lead man, who dare say?' It has not entered into the subtlest or the most prophetic heart to conceive what God has prepared for this most wonderful of all His creatures. This winsome lecture of Professor THOMSON'S creates in us afresh the conviction that man, despite his blemished record, can yet fairly be described as but a little lower than the angels, crowned with glory and honour, and confirms in us the assurance of the yet greater glory and honour to be.

In *The Platonic Tradition in English Religious Thought* (Longmans; 4s. net), Dean INGE tells us that the record of Christian institutionalism is one of the darkest chapters in history. From the highest point of view, ecclesiasticism, he argues, has been a dismal failure; and if at present it is having a kind of success, it is only at the expense of other types of religion, much nearer to the intention of the Divine Founder of Christianity. The book concludes with the reflection that 'There is a city in which we may have our "conversation," our πολίτευμα, even if secular politics become too debased for our participation, and Church policy too medieval for our loyalty—that city of which the type is "laid up in heaven."'

In this book the Dean returns to his contention that the doctrine of temporal progress as commonly held is no part of the Christian religion. Properly understood, the real teaching of Jesus about the future casts a deadly chill on what passes for Christianity among the majority. One would like to think that the point of view the Dean is decrying is that which looks forward to an indefinite increase in material welfare. But it is not that; at least, not only that; for the discussion of the subject is occasioned by his refusal to imitate the politicians in assuring us that the type of religion he advocates will soon be the prevailing type. He feels no certainty that it will.

Let it be granted that facile conceptions of human progress have usually been based on abysmal ignorance of the past, and that belief in continued material advancement has no very close relation to Christianity. But we have surely not been wrong in thinking that it is an item in the Christian faith that the downward pull in life will not always be the strongest pull, and that evil will not win the final victory over good. But, whether we share the Dean's depressing views of the present state and future fate of the type of religion for which he stands, or whether we do not share them, we can at least pay our tribute to the beauty and power with which he expounds that type.

Since the Reformation, there have been two schools of thought in Western Christendom, the Protestant and the Catholic. Catholicism is the religion of authority; it emphasizes the institution and the creed. Protestantism believes in the individual; its motto is a free Church in a free State, freedom for all, especially the right of the individual to think for himself and to accept whatever new truth in any sphere inquiry may bring to light. Protestantism misunderstands itself when it, too, seeks an infallible authority and finds in the verbal inspiration of Scripture that final court of appeal which the Catholic finds in the Pope. By undermining this false foundation of Protestantism, Biblical Criticism will, in the long run, be doing it a service.

Yet there is a third kind of belief in life which

transcends the distinction between Protestant and Catholic. The followers of the Reformers have dwelt much in the thought of Paul; but Paul was most truly Pauline, not when he wrestled with the problem of the Law, nor when he enunciated his doctrine of justification by faith, but when his mind revolved around the thoughts: 'Christ in me,' 'I in Christ.' He who lives in view, not of the seen things that pass but of the unseen things that abide, has penetrated to the core of Christianity. Since the days of Paul and of John, there has been a Christianity which is a religion of the spirit, which believes that the most real things in the universe are absolute and eternal values—what Plato called Ideas—and that these values can be known by all who are prepared to pay the price. The price is not asceticism in the things of the bodily passions, but 'whole-hearted consecration of the intellect, will, and affections to the great quest.'

Those whose Christianity is of this type belong to a spiritual succession which stretches back into history far beyond even the Christian era. In the first millennium before Christ there was a revolt, at first in Asia, afterwards in Greece and South Italy, against that type of culture in which the structure of society was built up on the worship of the forces of Nature. Behind the ebb and flow of phenomena, there began to be recognized an unseen universe of unchanging spiritual realities. In this movement, the great name was Plato. 'What (he asked) if man had eyes to see that pure Beauty, unalloyed with the stains of material existence, would he not hasten to travel thither, happy as a captive released from his prison-house? Such was the call, which, once heard, has never long been forgotten in Europe.'

The religion of the spirit suffered a serious reverse at the Reformation; not that the Reformers were not its friends, but this is a religion that does not flourish in an atmosphere of controversy. All war is barbarous, even religious war. The combatants want popular catchwords and make appeals to ancient authority. In such an environment, he whose only motto is 'The unseen things are eternal' cuts a sorry figure. Yet the Platonic tradition lived on: in poets like Shelley, Wordsworth, and Coleridge; in didactic prose-writers like Ruskin and Emerson; in philosophers like Green, the Cairds, and Bosanquet. And when once again the Church holds up Christianity before the eyes of men as the religion of the spirit, then those who ought to be of her fellowship (the Dean will not go further than this cautious estimate) will return to the fold.

To most of this we can all subscribe. To be assured that there is a pearl of abiding worth, such that all the pearls on which we instinctively set our hearts are well lost if we can win the precious pearl, gives to life a meaning and dignity. But is this the deepest thing in Christianity? Is not the central thing in Christianity that God so loved the world that He gave His Son, that the Divine Love takes on Himself human sorrow and human sin, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself?

The primary purpose of Dr. GORE's new book, *Can We then Believe?* (reviewed under 'Literature') is to pay attention to criticisms passed on his three apologetic volumes and to make such restatements as will suffice to meet the critics. Among the criticisms of most importance were certain animadversions by Dean Inge, Bishop Temple, and Dr. Mackintosh on his treatment of philosophical questions. Dr. Inge complains that these questions have not been adequately dealt with, and the other critics suggest that he has made use of terms like 'substance,' 'nature,' and 'person' that have been outgrown, at least in their former signification. To these criticisms Dr. GORE replies with an essay of some length on 'The Relations of Religion, Theology, and Philosophy,' that is full of interest, and with which the 'plain man' will be disposed strongly to agree.

Dr. Gore's first point is that when any one speaks of contemporary 'philosophy' as though it were a consistent body of thought he is speaking of something that does not exist. Science may be spoken of in this way. On the whole, and in spite of certain marked differences of opinion about points on the borderland between science and metaphysics, science does confront us with a solid body of results which we are bound to accept. But nothing of this kind can be said of philosophy. There does not exist a modern philosophy which proceeds from a coherent body and pronounces verdicts which must be accepted in the name of rationality. Both science and Catholic theology might make such a claim, but not philosophy.

There are, roughly speaking, two schools or kinds of philosophy which it is important to distinguish. One is the idealistic, which identifies the real and the rational, is entirely confident in the trustworthiness of the abstract reason, constructs its fabric *a priori* and presents an interpretation of the universe which makes it a phantasmagoria of the self-evolution of God and His return upon Himself. This is a perfectly well-defined 'school' marked by its supreme confidence in the abstract reason and largely oblivious of plain facts. This kind of philosophy is distrusted by the ordinary believer, and Dr. Gore considers that the distrust is well-founded.

The other school is that which grounds its conclusions on experience. Butler may be taken as its representative. Butler sticks close to facts and experience. He disbelieves in the power of abstract reason and in all *a priori* schematisms. He believes that the self-disclosure of God to man vindicates itself by being close-knit into the fabric of the natural experience which all admit. Now, great as may be the fascination of *a priori* rationalism, the method of Butler is the more solid way to truth.

The most important fact to recognize concerning philosophy is that it is a comparatively late comer into human history. Man had already built up a great structure of experience, relying on certain fundamental instincts, and continually verifying his instinctive assumptions in his growing knowledge of the world. This experience has taken three main directions. Man has come to be certain of the existence of outside bodies in Nature, of the reality of other persons, and of the presence of God. It was only after this experience of Nature, of man and of God (or gods), had had a long history that 'philosophy,' or speculative inquiry into the nature of the universe arose. Now mankind's attitude to this new intellectual inquiry has been this. So far as it has a real bearing on his experience he welcomes it. So far as it is an attempt to penetrate mysteries remote from man's practical experience he tolerates it. When it denies the realities of which he has had long experience he laughs at it or ignores it.

Some philosophers have denied the reality of material objects; others the reality of human freedom and responsibility, others the reality of God. With regard to the first two denials, man has simply smiled, sometimes with contempt. With regard to the third, he has mostly regarded it as a dangerous blasphemy. Now this instinctive reaction of mankind to speculations which seem to it contradictory to experience is rational. Experience is experience of reality. All along it has been verified as real within the sphere of man's present existence. Philosophy has done much in criticising current conceptions, in analysing mental processes, in establishing degrees of reality. But whenever it has cast doubts on the validity of his common experience man has either ridiculed it or ignored it. He *knows* that objects exist, he knows that freedom is a reality, he knows that God is. Let philosophy explain his experience and correct, if need be, his expression of it, but not explain it away. This is the attitude of common sense to philosophy, and it is entirely legitimate.

Sound philosophy, then, is the philosophy of experience. Its task is to show its unity and coherence, and to seek to reach a general and rational conception of the whole world-order. But

it must lay its foundations deep in the actual experience. It becomes negligible just in so far as it lays itself open to the charge of ignoring it and dealing in *a priori* and unverifiable conceptions. Take as an example Christian experience. Religion, and especially the Christian religion, neither has its roots in philosophy nor its development through philosophical considerations. It has developed as a self-disclosure of God accepted in faith. No doubt philosophy can vindicate the existence of God as a postulate needed to give a rational interpretation of the world. But the God of the philosophers falls very far short of the God of the Christian revelation, very far short of what the best spiritual experience of mankind has needed, and has found, in the God and Father of Christian belief. And so one who shares the Christian belief, or even sympathizes with it, will not ground his faith on philosophical reasoning, but will begin at the other end of the problem. He will go to the New Testament, to begin with, where the faith is stated objectively. And he will construct his 'articles of belief' out of the materials of a working religion. That is already theology in the making, and it is worth while saying that not only religion, but theology also, is distinct from and prior to philosophy.

That is the substance of Dr. Gore's courageous and refreshing essay. In the latter part he vindicates the task of theology in seeking the best terms and intellectual forms in which to express coherently the main basal facts of religious experience. His purpose is mainly to defend the use of 'substance,' 'hypostasis,' and 'nature,' in describing the Trinity and the Person of Christ, and he uncompromisingly declares that no better terms could have been found, or, indeed, can be found to-day, to express the facts about the Divine being and the realities of Christ's life. Theology is not philosophy, but leads the way to philosophy. Its purpose is to reduce to order and coherence the various ideas and doctrines which form the background and supply the motive of religion in practice, and to find the best practicable terms to express those ideas and doctrines. The theology is based upon the acceptance of the religion, and seeks to reduce it to a reasoned system, presupposing its authority. No doubt it has necessary limitations in all directions. It does not claim absolute truth. But the realities are there and are founded firmly in the experience of mankind.

It required some courage thus to beard the philosophers in their den! For Dr. Gore's contention really is that abstract philosophy is of little account. Its deliverances are abstract and *a priori* and in the air. It is not on solid ground at all. The great facts of religion are grounded on life, on the experience of a thousand generations. The great facts of the Christian religion are grounded on thousands of years' experience and on millions of saintly lives. These are solid foundations. But philosophy is not much more than a beating of the empty air. It required a good deal of audacity to say all that. But very many 'plain people' will be glad to have it said with such emphasis and persuasiveness!

The Parable of the Labourers (Matt. xx. 1–16).

By Professor W. A. Curtis, D.D., D.Litt., The University, Edinburgh.

For the preservation of this wonderful and haunting story we are indebted to the piety and insight of the First Evangelist. A fascinating gem, he presents it to us in a glorious setting. Who can open his Gospel anywhere between the opening of the eighteenth chapter and the close of the twenty-second without experiencing an overwhelming sense of the power and splendour of the Master's mind? Parable follows parable in swift succession, it matters not whether framed in their original context or caught up by the writer's ecstasy and set down as the spirit moved him. Hard saying follows hard

saying with triumphant appeal to the uttermost idealism of which the ancient or modern disciple has been capable. 'Except ye turn, and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven. . . . If thy hand or thy foot causeth thee to stumble, cut it off, and cast it from thee. . . . If any man have a hundred sheep, and one of them be gone astray. . . . If thy brother sin against thee, go, shew him his fault between him and thee alone. . . . Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them. . . . [Forgive thy brother] until seventy times seven. . . . What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. . . . Suffer the little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven. . . . If thou wouldest be perfect, go, sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me. . . . It is hard for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven. . . . Every one that hath left houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit eternal life. But many shall be last that are first; and first that are last.'

Upon these closing words of the nineteenth chapter hangs the Parable we are to study, and with the same oracular sentence, compound of darkness and light, the Parable itself concludes. It is at once the text and the *envoi*. A little later we read the answer of Jesus to the mother of the sons of Zebedee: 'whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister'; the tribute to mountain-moving faith and believing prayer; the Parable of the Two Sons bidden 'go work to-day in my vineyard'; the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, that moving sequel to Isaiah's Vineyard Parable which is Jesus' autobiography in miniature and contains five words the pathos of which is unsurpassed in Scripture: 'they will reverence my son'; and the Parable of the Wedding Feast of the king's son. Truly an exacting context for any story! But the Parable of the Labourers is worthy of it. Of the hard lessons in that amazing sequence it has one of the hardest to convey, and it conveys it with signal success.

It is a poignant scene that rises up from memory to serve the Great Illustrator as He pauses in search of a fit similitude. Then, as now, the spectre of unemployment hung over the lot of working-men. The Son of man, whose eye missed nothing that touched man, had seen it with compassion. Just as the spring-time figure of the sower casting his grain to right and left called up the thought of the preaching of God's Word, and the golden fields of summer made Him think of God's own harvest, so in the market-place the spectacle of honest men standing idle because no man had hired them became a symbol of the religious life, of 'the kingdom of heaven.' There is no suggestion in the story that the labourers were responsible for their unemployment or were at fault as shirkers. They were in the hiring-stance, the market-place, willing to work, wanting to work.

One pictures the season as vintage. The vineyard with its ripened clusters calls for additional hands for the ingathering. The work cannot wait. The owner, up betimes, sets out to look for the men he needs. Early as it is, some are forthcoming, and at their own figure, the Roman penny, an ample day's wage, they are promptly sent off to the vineyard. Three hours pass, and again the market-place is visited on the same quest, and another group of labourers out of work is found. The day is now broken. Glad to be hired at this later hour they are in no mood to bargain. 'Whatsoever is right I will give you,' says the master, and they are content. At noon and at mid-afternoon it is the same. 'And about the eleventh hour he went out and found others standing, and he saith unto them, Why stand ye here all the day idle? They say unto him, Because no man hath hired us. He saith unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard.' This time there is not a word about terms, on either side. Amazed that with but an hour of day before them they have found employment, they are glad to go. Evening falls, and the day of toil is over. By the humane enactment of the old lawgiver they are to receive their wages before they disperse: poor men are not to be kept waiting till the morrow for their money. 'Thou shalt not oppress an hired servant that is poor and needy, . . . in his day thou shalt give him his hire, neither shall the sun go down upon it, for he is poor, and setteth his heart upon it' (Dt $24^{14.\ 15}$). The steward receives his strange instructions and acts upon them, paying first the men hired last. 'They received every man a penny.' A full day's wage for a single hour's work! But though the next verse is charged with humour it is not suggested that the fortunate recipients of the full pay for the broken day protested or com-

plained. It is when the men who according to custom had struck a bargain with the master at the beginning of the day receive in turn the penny for which they had stipulated that human nature breaks loose. 'They supposed that they would receive more . . . and . . . they murmured against the householder, saying, These last have spent but one hour, and thou hast made them equal unto us, which have borne the burden of the day and the scorching heat.' The master in the Parable may not smile: there is indeed a grimness in his answer though it is softened by the word 'Comrade,' Ἑταῖρε, with which he addresses one of the murmurers: but there is an unmistakable smile in the eyes and on the lips of the Master who tells the story, 'Friend, I do thee no wrong: didst not thou agree with me for a penny? Take up that which is thine, and go thy way; it is my will to give unto this last, even as unto thee. Is it not lawful for me to do that I will with mine own? or is thine eye evil, because I am good?'

Such is the Parable. It is masterly alike as a whole and in its detail, stamped throughout with the impress of the Master of Parable. As if conscious that the lesson He has to teach is exceptionally difficult for the disciple, He, for once, harnesses paradox to parable for its conveyance. If parable makes truth easier to grasp, arrays it in a homely and familiar vesture, paradox makes truth more elusive, clothes it in a garb that is strange and startling. If parable gains for a great idea a ready entrance into the mind, paradox secures for it a permanent lodging. When a truth is unwelcome it must be made not only to penetrate but to stick. Parable is the point, paradox the barb.

The Parable was addressed to the disciples, not to the crowd. It is spoken for Christians, not for the world. Like much else that is imperishable in the teaching of our Lord, we owe it to the blundering impulsiveness and narrow vision of Simon Peter. Its permanent mission is indeed to correct an error to which good men are prone. Only a moment ago Peter was listening to the brief and touching dialogue between the Master and the Rich Young Man who had kept the Law, but felt that something more was needful to attain the perfect life. Master and disciples were deeply impressed as the youth went away, with downcast eyes, sorrowing because he was bidden to renounce his great possessions. In silence they mused awhile, none caring to speak, until Jesus said: 'It is hard for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven . . . but with God all things are possible.' Then answered Peter: 'Lo, we have left all, and followed thee; what then shall we have?' Christ's fisherman had not yet got away from the market, nor risen above the market spirit. The fish-scales still clung to his toil-worn fingers. Some part of him still remained where, with soiled hands, men haggle over bargains and nothing changes owners without a price. Had he indeed *left all* if he was still thinking of rewards? 'What shall we have?' It was men, not praise or benefits, that he was called to fish for. To follow Christ is not to dog the footsteps of a paymaster with one's eye fixed upon his purse. Patient and kind as ever, Jesus made reply: 'Ye who have followed me shall share my glory in the regeneration, every one that hath left home for my name's sake shall receive a hundredfold and shall inherit eternal life. Notwithstanding, of these, many shall be last that were first, and first that were last,' for in the spiritual life, the Kingdom, earthly analogies of wage-earning and precedence are transcended.

In the world, and for good reasons, a labourer is paid for his work either by the hour or by the job. He makes his contract. The Law with its sanctions looks on and says at most: 'Pay him a fair wage, honour your obligation, and, since he is poor, do not postpone his payment till the morrow.' It is just, and it is wholesome. What could be more reasonable than to adjust the wages to the work, reckoned either by the time spent upon it or by the amount done? Human nature being what it is, to pay the loiterer or the lie-abed or the work-shy as much as the punctual and industrious worker, is an affront to conscience and an incentive to demoralization. Who will be early in the market-place in search of work if noon or afternoon or evening will serve to secure a hire and a full-day's wage? Whether in business or in religion, there is a deep-seated instinct and conviction, fortified by experience, on the side of the simple rule: 'So much work, so much pay.' Thus far the Parable runs smoothly. It is exquisitely natural. Are we to have another version of the Story of the Talents? In rushes the paradox to dispel the expectation, with a shock to jolt us to a higher truth. If you conceive of God as a taskmaster, as a paymaster, as the Law has taught you in its stern and unvarying pre-occupation with justice, it will not do to rest content with the analogy of earth's market-place.

More has to be said. The same compassion that moves His heart as He beholds men spiritually unemployed, threatened with religious destitution and ruin, is also present at the reckoning. The Master of the morning and the afternoon is the Master of sundown. He knows, He understands, He cares, He sympathizes, He is righteous, but His righteousness holds more in the balance of just judgment than time served and work accomplished. His call came to different men at different hours. The servants instanced were all ready to respond. The later the call, the greater their alacrity, and the less their concern about terms. The last were paid first, not because they were more deserving, though they showed a less calculating spirit, but, so far as the Parable goes, in order that the first come, being last served, may plainly see the treatment of their fellows and, like the disciples, may learn the Master's lesson. The murmurers appeal to justice, and by the Law, on their own level, they are answered: 'Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?' The answer may suffice for them, and rebuke their envy, but it does not explain the Master's action. That remains above them, beyond them. 'It is my will to give unto this last even as unto thee.' The will of the Master, choosing to transcend Law, is *Grace*. Fundamentally, the Parable is a parable of Grace, belonging to the fellowship of teachings at whose head the Parable of the Prodigal Son stands, and whose burden is not so much ethical as evangelic.

As one ponders the story, and recalls the long history of its interpretation, one receives a fresh impression of the profundity of the abiding need for such a teaching, even in the Christian world. The disciples were perturbed, and in every age their successors have evinced the same confusion in contemplating it. But no subtlety and no sophistry are needed for its explanation. Why pretend that the eleventh-hour men worked twelve times as hard as the first called? Grace is always a problem for law, and law is always a problem for grace. The difficulty is inevitable. What becomes of justice if charity steps in to interfere? What becomes of charity if justice brooks no intervention? Conscience and religion have never ceased to wrestle with the problem both as it concerns the present life and as it concerns the hereafter.

Within the limits of the Parable, the difficulty is somewhat attenuated. As we have seen, it was through no fault that the later were later and the last were last. If it was no fault that the first before going to work made an agreement, trusting the master to keep it, there was merit in the faith of the later and the last that the master would do right by them without terms laid down. The late arrivals, moreover, had the morrow's bread to provide for their homes, equally with the early. And there were both envy and censoriousness in the very natural murmuring. The harder and the longer we toil, the more difficult it is for any man to say: 'I am an unprofitable servant; I have but done what it was my duty to do.' And, after all, the eleventh-hour labourer is a very different figure from the prodigal in the sister Parable with the murmuring of whose righteous elder brother we have scant sympathy.

But when one realizes that the Parable is a homely analogy caught up from earth to point to heaven, lifted from daily life to set forth life that is eternal, who can resist its appeal or linger over its plainly intentional difficulties? God is the Great Employer of souls. Spiritual life is His vineyard. Short or long, man's allotted span is a day. At sunset comes the reckoning. The award is that eternal life on which the Teacher had just before been dwelling. Can you divide eternal life, the peace of God that passeth understanding, heaven, into fractions, fewer or more of which can be doled out in reward of the varying merit of earthly life? You can break up the Roman penny into its sixteen component pieces, but there is difficulty in subdividing 'the joy of your Lord' into which the faithful are bidden enter in common, whatever be the number of their talents. 'If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?' Therein lies the spirit of the Parable. God is good. God is gracious, as well as discerning. When He gives, faith receives without measure. If He is the Great Employer, He pays His willing workers not by time nor by piece-rate, but according to their spirit of service and His spirit of grace. There is no market-place in heaven; let there be none in religion, earth's foretaste of heaven. Think more of opportunity, less of reward. Eternal life cannot be reckoned as any servant's due, as any saint's earnings. Rejoice when others are called, though their hour comes later in the day than yours. Least and greatest, last and first, forget these distinctions while you press on to life's end and goal.

Trust God and remember that He is infinitely good. 'For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.' The Searcher of hearts can judge as no human master can. His estimate of a man's life in His service takes account of more than the hours of toil and the worker's completed output.

Narrowly judged, no one of the listening disciples was a labourer hired at the break of day. Some part of their life had already passed before their Master called them to His vineyard, His fishing, His building. The Master Himself had not left home and family and livelihood till He was thirty years of age. Within the Christian circle it was inevitable that the day of service should vary with the hour of calling. A few years later the advent of Saul the Pharisee was to inflict upon the company of believers this very problem in its acutest form. An eleventh-hour labourer Paul seemed, even when suspicion was allayed concerning his loyalty, and his apostolic power was beyond question. He remains the classical example of the last becoming first, the supreme vindication of the lesson of the Parable. But from the first the story suggested a manifold application. As the labourers first called viewed their later fellows, as the elder brother thought about the prodigal returned, so Israel looked upon the Gentile world when it turned to the One True God, the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. 'Verily,' cried Jesus, in the chapter which follows the Parable, 'I say unto you, That the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom before you.' Last first, first last! That, in the vocabulary of the Teacher, is His vivid way of insisting on the element of surprise in God's judgment. It is but one of His many didactic paradoxes. Common sense the fruit of groping experience, and common justice the essence of law, have their wholesome conventions. But the last word rests with God their Master. He judges as a Father. His judgment, well for all men, unites justice with love as well as mercy. 'Is thine eye evil, because I am good?'

The Parable was not spoken to proclaim an economic reform, but to teach a religious lesson of charity, disinterestedness, and serene trust in God. Yet it is wonderful to observe how it anticipated the highest trend of enlightened progress in the economic sphere. Centuries of unrest and experiment in the world of labour and employment, centuries of aspiration and disillusionment in the realm of work and wages, have only brought us to the Teacher's feet. 'Be ye imitators of God as beloved children' is but an apostolic variant of His own startling exhortation: 'Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.' The picture, in the Parable, of God the Great Employer rising above time-rate and piece-rate has lodged in the world's memory and imagination a conception of employership too humane to be mechanical and indiscriminate. Guilds and trade unions, with social legislation in their wake, have been reaching out towards the realization of the same ideal. Like a ray of unflickering light the story we have been studying has pointed the way. It is the way to the heart of God, and it is the way for man.

Literature.

A NEW 'LUX MUNDI.'

A NUMBER of Anglo-Catholic leaders in the Church of England have combined to produce a volume which may be regarded as a kind of manifesto of their party and an intellectual expression of their general standpoint—*Essays Catholic and Critical*, by 'Members of the Anglican Communion,' and edited by Mr. Edward Gordon Selwyn (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net). The writers include Professor A. E. Taylor, who holds the Chair of Moral Philosophy in Edinburgh University, Dr. A. E. J. Rawlinson, the Rev. J. K. Mozley, the Rev. N. P. Williams, the Rev. E. Milner-White, Dr. E. J. Bicknell, and others. The significance of the title lies in the effort common to all the writers, to combine the traditional and the scientific spirit, temper, and standpoint. The general results of Biblical criticism are accepted, sometimes much too easily in our judgment and in one or two instances with dangerous generosity or laxity, but this is combined with a tenacious fidelity to 'Catholic' dogma. This is a

brave enterprise but a difficult one. If one rejects (as these writers do) *both* the literal verbal inspiration of the Bible and the ultramontane doctrine of the Church, the question that insists on being answered is, 'Where then is your religious authority?' This question is faced in the book by two writers, but, we must affirm, with very indifferent success. In last month's EXPOSITORY TIMES an analysis was given of the doctrine of authority stated in this book. Roughly, it is that the authority of a truth lies in the consensus of Christian experience that is behind it, and this consensus is to be found in the Catholic Church. But this only begins to answer the question. What is the Catholic Church? Is it the Church universal? or only 'Catholic' in some narrower sense? And if in the narrower sense, then is it to be found in the Roman Church or in the Orthodox Eastern Church or in the Church of England, or in all of these? If in all of them, what of the vast amount of religious experience outside these bodies? What of the Free Churches of England, the great Presbyterian Church of Scotland, the Lutheran Church, and the enormous masses of Christians in the Near East? If authority rests on Christian experience, surely these great Churches have some authority to plead. But if the Christian experience of these bodies is to count in assessing the authority of any truth, what becomes of the Anglo-Catholic contention? Protestant bodies are spoken of in this volume with a slight sense of condescension as possessing some elements of Catholic truth. But 'the Catholic Church of early days is its acknowledged inspiration, the Catholic Church of these days its unacknowledged buttress,' whereas Rome, and even the Papacy, are spoken of with appreciation and more than appreciation. We have read these able essays with very much sympathy. But we confess that we have not found anywhere a clear and satisfactory apologia for the Anglo-Catholic basis. Nowhere is the 'Catholic' Church defined. Nowhere is it identified. The assertion of a religious authority tails away into a vague emphasis on Christian experience. We cannot imagine a really intelligent inquirer being satisfied with the position here laid down.

The book consists of three parts. The first deals with the presuppositions of the Faith and contains three essays. That by Professor Taylor on 'The Vindication of Religion' is on conventional lines (faith in God is rested on Nature, the moral life of man and religious experience), but it is extremely able and even brilliant at some points. The essays on authority are comprised in this part. The second portion of the book contains six essays dealing with the statement and defence of the Catholic faith, on the Christian conception of God, on the Christ of the Synoptic Gospels, on the Incarnation, on Sin, on the Atonement, and on the Resurrection. There will be general agreement with most of what is written in this section. The essay on the Gospels is marred by the identification of the extremist views on the historical situation in the Gospels with liberal Protestantism. The attitude to criticism adopted in this volume is itself at points extremely 'liberal,' and there is a great body of Christian scholars who are as believing as the writers of this book and at the same time 'critical' in their attitude and yet not at all in sympathy with the unbelieving conclusions of men like Kirsopp Lake. In the other essays there is nothing that can be called a contribution of note. The Rev. Kenneth Kirk grapples courageously with the problem of the Atonement, but while justifying much of the traditional language about the death of Christ, he does not seem to us to have gone much, if anything, beyond a 'moral' theory. He shows that we cannot make due acknowledgment of our guilt to God, that some one adequate to the task must do so, that Christ has done this for us, and that we can make this sacrifice our own. But he omits just the vital point to explain how this affects God. He does not succeed in showing with any clearness how our relations with God are changed by this act of ours. We do not seriously complain of this, since many have essayed the task without satisfying the general mind. The essay is interesting and helpful in many ways.

It is in the third part of the book that we come to the most crucial phase of the argument. There are four essays, one on the Church in History, one on the Reformation, one on the origin of the Sacraments, and one on the Eucharist. The third of these, on the Sacraments generally, is the ablest contribution to this book. It contains a brilliant criticism of the 'mystery-religions' theory of the origin of the Sacraments as well as a persuasive defence of the historical validity of the Sacraments. The essay is somewhat marred by one or two defects. Its representation of the 'Protestant' doctrine of the Sacraments is so wrong-headed as to be almost grotesque. 'Protestants' are said to believe about the Sacraments that they are not 'means of

grace' but only signs which are efficacious because of their subjective influence. Hence there is no absolute duty to assist at them. In short, the 'Protestant' doctrine is that they are 'declaratory,' 'subjective,' and 'optional.' Mr. Williams is incapable of conscious misrepresentation, so we must conclude that he has never really heard of the basal documents of Scottish Presbyterianism. He will be surprised to hear the definition of the Lord's Supper in the Scottish Shorter Catechism. 'The Lord's Supper is a sacrament, instituted by Christ, wherein by the giving and receiving of bread and wine . . . His death is showed forth, and the worthy receivers are, not after a corporal and carnal manner, but by faith, made partakers of His body and blood to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace.' Could there be a more objective doctrine than that? That has always been the doctrine of Presbyterianism, that the Sacraments are 'means of grace' through which the grace of God reaches the soul. Another point of weakness in this essay is that while there is a convincing criticism of the theory that the Sacraments originated in the mystery religions, the writer fails to meet the theory that 'Catholicism' did originate in the influence of these religions on Christianity. But, these points aside, we are grateful to the writer for one of the most enlightening essays on the sacramental element in our religion that we have read. The concluding essay on 'The Eucharist' is a quaint production. It contains an ingenious theory about the sense in which the Eucharist is a sacrifice, avoiding the Roman view that the sacrifice of Calvary is *repeated* in the Eucharist and yet making the sacrifice in the Eucharist a perpetual renewal of it.

Speaking generally, this volume seeks to present a basis for 'Catholic' belief and practice which will avoid the extremes of Romanism and Protestantism, while holding the door open in both directions. With the utmost goodwill we must pronounce the result as in our judgment unsuccessful. Something more masculine and solid than the doctrine of authority here presented must be reached if Anglo-Catholics are to have a firm ground to stand on. If Christian experience is to be the basis, then 'Catholic' must be widened in its significance. But the writers of this book have laid us all under a sense of gratitude for their attempt to state and defend for the modern mind and in an open-minded way the things we all in essence most surely believe.

DR. GORE'S SUPPLEMENT.

Dr. Gore's three volumes on the reconstruction of belief were read with avidity and admiration. The agreement with his argument probably lessened as he went on from 'Belief in God' to 'The Holy Spirit and the Church,' but every reader must have been impressed by the mental virility, the intellectual resources, and the loyal fidelity to his convictions of the former Bishop of Oxford. (We think of him always as Bishop Gore.) Few men of our time have done more (or as much) for positive faith than Dr. Gore. And now we have a supplementary volume, in which he summarizes the conclusions of his three famous essays and replies to criticisms of them. The restatement of his argument is rendered, if not necessary, at least desirable by the issue of many valuable contributions both philosophical and religious, and Dr. Gore leaves us wondering if he ever sleeps, by the list of some of the books he has recently been reading. It is in view of this mass of literature, these hostile criticisms, and also of his own sense of shortcoming at certain points that Dr. Gore has been led to write this further book.

Briefly, the line Dr. Gore takes is this. Having ascertained and stated clearly what the religion of the New Testament is, he asks whether this can be maintained in face of modern science, and then whether it rests on a sufficient historical basis. Having thus securely grounded the spiritual beliefs about God and God in Christ, he contends in a concise lecture that the Christian religion from its start was the religion of a sacramental Church. There is a very delightful lecture in addition, in which it is made clear that in a true religion the institutional, the intellectual, and the mystical elements must be included in a synthesis. There are many additional notes or little essays at the end in which the writer discusses points which have been raised or which he did not fully or clearly enough discuss in his former volumes. And between the main lectures and these notes is a long essay of surpassing interest on the relations of Religion, Theology, and Philosophy. This is one of the best things in this very fascinating book, and has the merit of being new. For the rest, as the book is largely a restatement of positions already expounded and freely criticised, it is not necessary to go into it in detail. The part of the argument that is most disputable is that on the

original sacramental character of Christianity. This is volume three of his great trilogy compressed into one chapter, and it seems to us to gain in persuasiveness by the compression. But whether we agree with Dr. Gore or disagree, he is always interesting and always helpful, and, especially, always suggestive. The title of his new book is *Can We then Believe?* (Murray; 6s. net).

PREACHING IN MEDIEVAL ENGLAND.

This is not an age that is enamoured of preaching. Rather does it agree with Trollope, 'There is perhaps no greater hardship at present inflicted on mankind in civilized and free countries than the necessity of listening to sermons.' Accordingly it does not seem likely that there can be a crowded audience for *Preaching in Medieval England*, one of the Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, by Mr. G. R. Owst, M.A., Ph.D. (Cambridge University Press; 17s. 6d. net). Yet it is an interesting study into which there has been heaped a mass of work and learning. Its author starts from this, that after making due allowance for rhetorical exaggeration and the like, there lies in the sermonic literature of every period a mirror of itself, a vast profusion of vivid facts which historians have been most unwise to overlook. At first one sympathizes with the historians, for to browse on endless wastes of old sermons seems an arid and unappetizing prospect. Yet Dr. Owst has found it fascinating, and he makes his reader feel the interest too; whether he is dealing with the preachers or their congregations or the sermons or the methods along which they were built up; all kinds of unexpected things keep bursting in. As one listens to the loud buzz of conversation and open snoring in the medieval Church in sermon-time, with a few in the corners playing chess, and impatient people chanting *Dies transiit*, 'Time's up,' and meeting remonstrance with the bold answer, 'What do we want to listen to sermons for?' one has the comfortable feeling we are really getting on. And yet in the main how curiously familiar it all is—the complaints against Sunday dinners and Sunday games keeping folk from Church, and a general slackness that 'even the twelve Apostles' could not overcome; the thinness of the pews, 'English people are the worst sermon-goers in the world'; the scarcity of men at worship; the multitudes of 'helps for preachers' killing all originality; the incursions of churchmen into class and industrial disputes, though some, indeed, says one hot soul, were 'fawning creatures who could only wag their tails, not sheep-dogs but lap-dogs'—the lack of any shadow to a too genial gospel. All that sounds familiar. Women, it seems, did preach at one time, and the justifications of their exclusion from the pulpit do not sound convincing, the first being that they have not 'sufficient intelligence.' Of one thing Dr. Owst is very sure, that 'all that that unpopular word Puritanism has ever stood for, to the minutest detail, shall be found advocated unceasingly in the preaching of the Pre-Reformation Church. The long face, the plain diet, the plainer attire, the abstention from sports and amusements in company, the contempt of the arts, the rigid Sabbatarianism, the silence at meals, the long household prayers, the stern disciplining of wife and children, the fear of hell, the heavy mood of "wanhope," are typical of the message of the faithful friar as it may be read to-day.'

For the rest, Dr. Owst is certain that preaching has always declined when the eyes of the preacher 'are set on the face of the crowd instead of the Crucified.'

ISRAEL'S LIFE AND CULTURE.

There is no book quite like *Israel: Its Life and Culture*, by Johs. Pedersen, Professor of Semitic Philology in the University of Copenhagen. It was first published in Danish in 1920, and happily has now been translated into English by Mrs. Aslaug Möller, M.A., of the University of Copenhagen, and published at 15s. net by Mr. Humphrey Milford. It touches upon the history and the social life and customs of Israel, and on the religion and the theology of the Old Testament, but it is not a book about one or other of those things; it is rather an attempt to penetrate the inner mind of Israel, and a very searching and original attempt it is. It is concerned, as its author claims, with the 'fundamental psychological conception of the Israelites, which is the same throughout their history until their meeting with Hellenistic culture.' The titles of its chapters carry us into a field of study which is partly psychological, or even psychical, and partly social—for example, 'the soul, its power and capacity, the blessing, honour, and shame, the

name, peace and salvation, sin and curse,' etc.—but they give no idea of the freshness and power with which the world of ancient Hebrew ideas is treated. Professor Pedersen brings his psychological insight to bear, among other things, on Hebrew grammar and linguistic usage, such as the structure of sentences, connecting particles, and the style of argumentation. The study of the language gains a singular fascination from this attempt to penetrate into the mind of those who spoke it. But of more interest to the general reader is the skill with which Pedersen pierces behind a word like *shalom* and shows how rich and how implicated in primitive ideas is its connotation, and how inadequate is its conventional rendering by 'peace.'

Every part of the discussion is marked by a similar independence. This, for example, is what he has to say of the relation of JE to D. 'Great importance has been attached to the fact that the Yahwist-Elohist takes no account of the demand of Deuteronomy, that the temple of Jerusalem should be the only one, from which fact it is concluded that the former must be from an earlier time. But the difference between the two parts of the Pentateuch cannot be explained as a mere difference of time. The Yahwist-Elohist belongs to circles which are quite different from those of Deuteronomy. These circles considered life outside Jerusalem as the true Israelitic life, and consequently they saw no reason to acknowledge the claims of the priesthood of the capital.' As Mowinckel, one of the most stimulating writers of the present day on the Old Testament, confesses his profound obligation to Pedersen, this book should receive a wide welcome from all who desire to keep abreast of Old Testament studies.

CONFIRMATION.

We have received the first volume of a work on *Confirmation; or, The Laying on of Hands* (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net). The primary purpose of this first volume, which is by various writers, is to provide Anglican clergy with the historical and doctrinal background of the rite of Confirmation. The second volume, which is in preparation, will deal with practical matters connected with the rite. Dr. Lowther Clarke discusses the Laying On of Hands in the New Testament, tracing the origin of Confirmation even back to Pentecost, and finding the unity of Baptism and Confirmation to be more fundamental than their distinction. The recognition of Confirmation as an act complementary to Immersion and specially connected with the promised gift of the Holy Spirit for the strengthening of the Church appears to be common to all the contributors. Bishop A. J. Maclean expounds with much learning the theory and practice of Confirmation in the Church from the end of the Apostolic Age till the Reformation. But the longest and most important of the eight essays contained in the book is one by Canon Ollard of some two hundred pages, in which he sets forth the results of his researches into the history of Confirmation in the Anglican communion from A.D. 1500 to 1850. He brings out the relation of Calvinistic theology to the interpretation of the accounts of Ac 8 and 19, which form the 'acid test' for the teaching about Confirmation. He dwells appreciatively on Jeremy Taylor's 'Discourse of Confirmation,' an unrivalled and even unapproached work. And he concludes that the teaching, that by the laying on of the bishop's hands a gift of the Holy Spirit is given, appears as clearly in the nineteenth century as in the formularies of 1537 and 1540. Confirmation Rites, Confirmation in the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches, Confirmation and Baptism, the Theological Implications of Confirmation, are the other subjects treated, the last-named being by Dr. H. Maurice Relton.

The latest Fernley Lecture was delivered by Dr. A. S. Geden, a keen student of Eastern religions as well as of the Old Testament. He entitled his theme *The Evangel of the Hebrew Prophets* (Epworth Press; 5s. net). By putting a very generous interpretation upon the word 'prophet,' he draws the whole of the Old Testament within the orbit of his discussion, with the result that about two-thirds of his book constitutes a sort of Introduction to the Old Testament, with special emphasis on its spiritual value. The freshest and most valuable chapters are the three in which he discusses Parable and Metaphor in the Old Testament, The Old Testament Prophets and Nature, and the Old Testament and Art. The book leaves a powerful impression of the unity of the Old Testament amid all its diversity. It is thoroughly well informed, friendly

to criticism, but cautious with a slightly conservative bias ; for example, Dr. Geden is inclined to retain the paragraph on Judah in Am 2. But he frankly recognizes the presence of more hands than one in Ecclesiastes, which he regards as 'a volume of contributed essays, not the work of a single author.' Dr. Geden is too well acquainted with the difficulties of Old Testament Introduction to be dogmatic; he offers, for example, a balanced discussion of the *pros* and *cons* of the Elihu speeches in Job. His knowledge of the East enables him to throw light on the prophetic style and temperament, and he takes occasion to remind us how small a part logic, as we understand it in the West, has to play in carrying conviction home to an Eastern audience. In the last chapter the permanent contribution of the prophets to religion in presenting a God who is all-powerful, holy, just, and kind is persuasively set forth.

The Masterpiece of Jesus, by Mr. Frank Cox (Epworth Press ; 2s. 6d. net), is a series of studies of Jesus as Teacher, Ruler, Worker, and Leader. These titles are derived from the four Greek words in the Gospels which are all translated 'Master' in the English Bible. 'Each of these aspects of the Mastership of Jesus corresponds exactly to one of the four aspects of our Christian calling, as these are seen in our Lord's own teaching. These may be described as the School, the Kingdom, the Vineyard, and the Journey.' The writer pleads for the absolute lordship of Christ over all the departments of our human life. A useful appendix contains questions and topics for use in study circles.

In his work, *The History of the Church in France, A.D. 950–1000* (Epworth Press ; 7s. 6d. net), the Rev. Douglas W. Lowis, D.D., publishes a thesis approved by the University of London for the degree of D.D., the publication being aided by a grant from the University. While the author writes from the standpoint of a convinced believer in the Protestant Reformation, he is persuaded that the Mediæval Church, with all its faults, represented the best life of the world, and preserved civilization from collapse. It is one of the most obscure periods of Church History he seeks to illuminate, and in the endeavour he has made diligent and careful use of sources and authorities. Sometimes one feels that the pages are too closely packed, sometimes one desiderates more adequate documentary support of the judgments (as, for example, in the reference to the millennium), but the work taken as a whole appears to be as interesting and reliable as it is undoubtedly learned. Perhaps it will surprise some readers to gather from Dr. Lowis' volume how much movement there was both in the outer and the inner life of the Church in the times of Lothaire and Hugh Capet.

For those who are interested in Oriental literature and problems a sumptuous feast of suggestions is provided in the *Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society,* iv., edited by the Rev. John Muir, B.D., and published by the Society. We use the word 'suggestions' designedly, for only two of the original papers are reproduced in full : of the others only abstracts, within the limited space, were possible. But the abstracts are long enough to convey real stimulus and suggestion, and the variety of the volume furnishes pabulum for every conceivable taste. On the Hebrew side there are articles on the Psalms, on the names of God in Genesis, on the Old Testament in the New, on Jewish superstition, on the law of retaliation, etc. ; while Arabic interests are well represented by articles on Muslim traditions, Muslim schools in Syria, Arabic charms, Arabic numerals, the Caliphate, etc. And the Semitic interest, though predominant, is not exclusive : there are, for example, articles on superstitions in Southern India, and on Chinese Script and its significance for students of Chinese history. When it is added that these discussions are all conducted by competent and mostly well-known scholars, such as Professor A. R. S. Kennedy, Professor W. B. Stevenson, Dr. T. H. Weir, etc., it will be obvious that this is a volume which no one interested in the East, ancient or modern, can afford to neglect.

Dr. Moffatt's *Translations of the Old and New Testaments* require no commendation. So it will be sufficient to state that the publishers, Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton, have now issued them in the more convenient form of one volume. The price of the volume is 20s. net. The title is *New Translation of the Bible.*

The Kingsgate Press, London, send out a series of volumes under the general title of 'Christian Education Manuals,' of which the first six have

reached us. They are meant to cover the Christian life in a broad sense, including belief as well as practice. The titles will speak for themselves—*Baptist Principles, Man and his Character, The Christian Citizen, The Why of our Faith, Understanding the Bible,* and *Christian Education in the Church.* Two of the books are frankly Baptist in their standpoint, but the others are quite general in their treatment, and may be read (as, indeed, the first two also may) with profit and interest by any one. We confess to being most attracted by those on the Bible and on Education. Nothing more reasonable could be found on either subject. The Bible is dealt with in a thoroughly believing and yet thoroughly modern fashion. Misunderstandings are cleared away and the authority of Scripture is based on a perfectly secure foundation. We find ourselves in close and emphatic agreement with Mr. P. T. Thomson in his views on religious education, which rightly direct the teacher's mind to the development of the child's personality, and especially of that which is deepest in it, the spark of the Eternal. We commend these little books cordially, not only because they are modern and alive, but because of the ability with which they are written. It is to be hoped they will have a wide circulation. The price is 1s. net, and the writers are the Rev. H. Wheeler Robinson, D.D.; the Rev. F. Townley Lord, B.A., D.D.; the Rev. A. J. Nixon, B.A., B.D.; the Rev. P. T. Thomson; the Rev. E. E. Hayward, M.A.; and the Rev. Henry Cook, M.A.

Virginibus Christi, by Mother St. Paul (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net), contains a series of twenty-five short talks to nuns on the culture of the Christian life. In a brief foreword the hope is expressed that they 'may be useful to others beyond the little community to which they were originally given.' The frequent references to the 'religious life' and the circumstances of the convent may make the book less attractive to other readers, but the addresses are full of wise Christian counsels fitly expressed.

In a little work entitled *Seven in Scripture* (Marshall Brothers; 2s. 6d.), Mr. R. McCormack seeks to restore and establish the true text of Jn 17 and other passages in the Gospels. The occurrences of the number seven supply the clue. These are said to constitute God's secret mark upon Scripture in order to establish its Divine origin beyond cavil. Readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will have no difficulty in forming their own conclusions as to the validity and value of these studies in the 'heptadic structure' of Scripture.

Dr. Hartwig Hirschfeld has written a short *Literary History of Hebrew Grammarians and Lexicographers,* accompanied by unpublished Texts (Milford; 5s. net). With great learning he traces the work of successive scholars from the tenth to the sixteenth century, and helps us to feel how much hard thinking and scientific research lie behind the smooth statements of our modern Hebrew Grammars and Lexicons. Interspersed translations of certain sections of the work of these pioneer scholars add greatly to the interest of this learned book.

The interest which Miss Christabel Pankhurst has recently shown in the Second Coming is generally known. She has taken up the subject with characteristic ardour and supports her views with considerable intellectual and literary power. In *The World's Unrest* (Morgan & Scott; 5s. net), she argues for the imminence of a personal return of Christ to reign visibly on the earth. All hope of further progress of the race is illusory; the only possible solution is by a Divine apocalypse. Miss Pankhurst is deeply impressed by the work and plans of Mussolini, which she regards as one of the principal signs of the end. Just as the Roman Empire held the field at the time of the First Coming so a reconstituted Roman Empire will precede the Second Coming. The survey given of world politics is extremely cursory, and the method of interpreting the Scriptures is uncritical to the last degree. Events and texts are simply drawn from any quarter without discrimination to support the writer's theories. Some of the suggestions made are extraordinary, as that 'the Antichrist and his hosts will reckon that science enables them to thwart Christ's purpose to return. . . . By radio-activity they will seek to disturb and make impassable the upper atmosphere.' One would gladly pass over these extravagances, however, to pay tribute to the passionate loyalty to Jesus Christ which breathes through the pages. 'There is but one sure line of progress traceable through history, and that is the progress represented by God's carrying out of His purpose to bring in

everlasting righteousness through Jesus Christ our Lord.' 'To be for Christ—that is the important thing.' There all Christians will find themselves in cordial agreement.

Some years ago Dr. R. J. Campbell drew the attention of the Rev. F. G. Frost to the Works of F. W. Robertson. The outcome of that has been the publication this year of an excellent Anthology arranged by Mr. Frost, to which Dr. Campbell writes an introduction. The title of the volume is *The Message of F. W. Robertson* (Nisbet; 4s. 6d. net). It is specially suitable that the Anthology should appear this year, the Centenary of Holy Trinity Church, Brighton—that church which was made famous by the six memorable years when Frederick William Robertson ministered there.

A third edition has been issued of *The Reformation in England*, by Mr. W. H. Beckett (R.T.S.; 3s. 6d. net), which is partly an abridgment of 'The English Reformation of the Sixteenth Century,' by the same writer. It is a concise, lucid, and fair statement, while manifestly the work of a convinced Protestant and Evangelical. Not the least useful feature of the book is an appendix containing a carefully selected bibliography, while at the close of the various chapters helpful hints are given as to further reading.

Under the title of *The Western New Testament* (Routledge; 5s. net), the Rev. E. E. Cunnington, M.A., formerly Vicar of Llangarron, offers us a new translation of the New Testament based on the version of A.D. 1611. The Greek text used is E. Nestle's in the edition of his Greek Testament published by the British and Foreign Bible Society. The translation is competently done, and the Introduction contains pertinent criticisms in detail of both the Authorized and the Revised Versions. Among the many modern versions in English of the New Testament there appears to be room for Mr. Cunnington's version, which strikes a happy mean between the literalness of the construe and the freedom of the paraphrase, and incidentally provides an excellent 'key' to the Greek text.

Two more volumes have just been added to Canon Sell's admirable series of commentaries on the Old Testament. They are on *Leviticus* and *The Kingdom of Judah* (S.P.C.K. Depository, Vepery, Madras; 1 rupee: Church Missionary Society, Salisbury Square; 1s. 6d. each). They display the same power as the earlier volumes to present the results of sound and extensive scholarship in a thoroughly popular way. It is a great convenience to have the facts relative to the story of Judah sifted out from the Book of Kings and presented so as to form a consecutive story, and Canon Sell has wisely availed himself of the prophetic literature to give colour and incident to his story, pertinently remarking at one point that 'a study of the writings of Isaiah and Micah is absolutely necessary if the historical books are to be intelligently understood.' The Canon's treatment of his sources, though always edifying—for he has the pastor in view—is always frank: he is not afraid, for example, to speak of contradictions subsisting between Kings and Chronicles.

Of even greater value perhaps is his commentary on Leviticus, a book which contemporary emphasis on prophetic literature has tended to throw into the shade. Here Dr. Sell is very much at home; his intimate knowledge of Arabic literature and religious usage has enabled him to adduce many striking parallels. Many scholars would support him in the view that the attitude of the pre-Exilic prophets was 'not an absolute but a conditional rejection.' He is familiar with the most recent literature and knows the illustrative value of Frazer's 'Folk-Lore.' It is refreshing to meet such a comment as this. 'In the Christian Church there is no sacerdotal priesthood.' With this the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews would cordially agree. Canon Sell's commentaries are being translated into three of the principal languages of India, and have already been found very serviceable to Indian pastors. We do not wonder. Many a pastor at home would enlarge his knowledge and power by making the acquaintance of these excellent and inexpensive commentaries.

The Idea of God in the Psalms.

By F. Herbert Stead, M.A., London.

II.

This conception of God as more than all the world to us is an abiding heritage to our faith. We do not torture ourselves with the false theory that perplexed the Psalmists: from that the Crucified has for ever delivered us. But to our most enlightened Christian faith, the supremely Trustworthy One is also the Inexplicable. The things that our faith demanded as touching the Kingdom do not come to pass. Prayer for what is manifestly and incontrovertibly to our thinking included in the will of God, is not answered. The very opposite of what the highest and least selfish in us expected takes place. Our hopes are broken, our faith is shattered, we are enveloped in 'clouds and darkness'; the Numinous confronts us: what has happened seems to our keenest vision to be utterly wrong, utterly mischievous, utterly alien to the purpose of God. We may not be able to blame ourselves for the overturn; and even if we do find ample cause of blame in our poor selves, we know He would not inflict penal disaster if our main aim was right. For us, too, there is no eudæmonist solution. But there is for us, as for the Psalmists, the personal solution, the embosoming of the human personality in the Divine, come what will:

Si fractus illabatur orbis,
Impavidum ferient ruinæ:

not by hard Stoical αὐτάρκεια, but by the sufficiency that is of God,

The feeble hands and helpless,
Groping blindly in the darkness,
Touch God's right hand in the darkness
And are lifted up and strengthened.

One marvels how this high faith sprang up and was maintained through the long post-Exilic period. For the Psalms, whensoever or by whomsoever originated, were (as is generally admitted) selected, edited, revised, gathered into the collections now found in the Psalter, after the Exile. They reflect, therefore, the post-Exilic faith. The glowing prophecies of what would happen after the Return, which had emboldened the exiles to face the long march over the desert, remained utterly unfulfilled. The wealth and splendour, the power and grandeur, which reach their crowning portrayal in the Second Isaiah, were never attained in Zion. The returning exiles found themselves in a most precarious and unenviable condition: small in numbers, poor, unprotected among enemies, granted a very uncertain liberty under Persian satraps, often attacked, not seldom ravaged, their walls when built no sure refuge, their Temple, even, devastated and defiled. The disillusion must at times have amounted to an agony. The contrast between what they had been promised and what they really experienced might have flung the people into pessimism, doubt, and despair. Yet it is just in that long-drawn-out disappointment we hear the people singing, making a joyful noise unto God, exulting in Him; and their songs have become the music of the world.

How came this about? What led to this extraordinary result which seemed at such variance with the actual environment? The people might have been kept alive by the well-organized hierarchy, by the regular performance of the Temple cult and by the thick zereba of the Law. But these things would not have produced the burst of spiritual melody which has charmed the generations. The Psalms are a miracle of literature. Their production is a miracle of history. I can only trace them to a special gift of God bestowed upon that struggling group of returned exiles. The Psalms sprang out of the close fellowship of worship. They express the deep social realization of the presence of God. In the Temple and in the associations of which it was the centre, the people came close together in the adoration of Yahweh. What Jesus later promised to His followers, 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst,' was in a measure anticipated in the constant succession of Temple worship. Whatever brawls and disappointments there might be without; there within was the bondkinship intensely real: חסד was an abiding fact. The solidarity of Yahweh and His people was a palpable experience. At times so vivid was the realization of His presence that, we are told, the priests in adoring awe ceased to minister.

And those of us who cannot find an explanation of Hebrew prophecy in the merely human environment, but believe that the Central Personality of the universe shaped and called, endowed and empowered, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the rest, cannot withhold the conviction that the *social inspiration* of the worshipping community which produced the Psalms was as real and as special as the personal inspiration which was given to the prophets. Social inspiration—that it was which kept the people not only alive, but vibrant with unquenchable faith and vocal with triumphant song. By a supernormal gift of God, a social life was bestowed and fostered so intense and deep as to be more than national, and to be feeling its way to becoming universally human. In the Temple courts Yahweh was socially conceived, socially perceived, socially received. The joy of that self-bestowal is echoed in many and many a Psalm:

A day in thy courts is worth a thousand (84^{10}).

My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God:
When shall I come and appear before God? (42^{2}),

Then will I go unto the altar of God,
Unto God the gladness of my joy (43^{4}).

In the multitude of thy חסר will I come into thy house (5^{7}).

I love the habitation of thy house,
And the place where thy glory dwelleth (26^{8}).

One thing have I asked of Yahweh,
That will I seek after:
That I may dwell in Yahweh's house all the days of my life:
To behold the delight of Yahweh . . . (27^{4}).

We have thought on thy חסר, O God, in the midst of thy temple (48^{9}).

Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God hath shined forth (50^{2}).

O Zion . . . all my fountains are in thee (87^{7}).

My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth, for the courts of Yahweh (84^{2}).

Such intense social experience reaches home to the core of humanity and to the heart of God. It is implicitly always, and often in the Psalms explicitly, universal:

Thou art the confidence of the ends of the earth (65^{5}).

All the ends of the earth shall turn unto Yahweh (22^{27}).

The refrain:

Oh that men would praise Yahweh for his goodness,
And for his wonderful works to the children of men! (107^{8}).

shows us חסר extending beyond the confines of Israel and reaching to all men:

The earth is full, O Yahweh, of thy חסר (119^{64}).

The bud is almost bursting into the flower of God's solidarity with humanity. And a proof of this is the general adoption of the Psalms as the song-book of the race.

Modern criticism has not only conferred upon the world the discovery of the prophets of Israel; it has made the period between the Return and the rise of the Maccabees luminous with the glory of the social revelation of God in the Psalms. The former gift disclosed the Divine potency of human personality: the latter the Divine potency of human society.

In the light of the suggestions I have made, it remains for me to glance at one or two illustrative Psalms:

Ps 90 is perhaps the most wonderful exhibition of the paradox of psalmic religion. It opens in majestic strain. God is one: Creator of the world, eternal. On His human side, He is our abode, our home, our refuge in all generations. So far all is stately, helpful, and worthy of its theme. Then follows the contrast between God's eternity and power, and the brief and frail life of mortal men. It is couched in terms that sharply collide with the opening verse. Our abode or refuge in all generations now becomes our fierce and angry Tormentor. He crushes us to dust. He sweeps us away as in a flood. We fade like the ephemeral grass under the heat of His anger. In His anger we are consumed: in His rage we flee away. All our days pass in the ebullition of His wrath. Our poor seventy years are but a moan, and any years beyond that limit are but labour and vanity. Our dread is proportioned to the outburst of His wrath.

These verses remind us of Browning's 'Caliban on Setebos':

He doth His worst in this our life,
Giving just respite lest we die thro' pain,
Saving last pain for worst,—with which, an end.
. . . . . .
Who made them weak, meant weakness He might vex.

So through all the strata deposited by prophetic thought and popular ethics, shoots up the ancient Thunder-God:

Fast invading fires begin! White blaze—
. . . and there, there, there, there, there,
His thunder follows! Fool to gibe at Him!

Then the later and nobler faith begins with much tremor to return. The thunder-storm of Divine wrath may pass—though a few lines before, all our days were spent under the shadow and terror of it—how long will it last? Come back! Have mercy! Satisfy us with Thy חסד. Let Thy sunshine last as long as Thy raging storm. Show Thy splendour to our children. Let Thy horrors give way to beauty, Thy beauty. Wither not up our poor efforts in the heat of Thine anger, but establish them.

What a bundle of contradictions the Psalm contains! After the calm dignity of the first lines, the writer yields to spasm after spasm of terror, of abject contrition, then of suppliant hope, and finally of a faith slowly recovering.

Ps 36 offers a contrast of another kind, not between Yahweh enraged and Yahweh appeased, but between the oracular utterance of the depraved conscience that our evil conduct is no concern to the Deity, that evil may be designed, and spoken, and done, without fear of detection or punishment; and the ecstatic ascription from the devout heart to Yahweh of moral perfectness. The most joyous confidence is expressed:

O Yahweh, thy חסד is in the heavens;
Thy faithfulness reacheth unto the skies.
Thy righteousness is like the mountains of God;
Thy judgements are a great abyss.

In this last line the Numinous emerges, not of the fulminant kind. The Psalmist is absolutely sure of the perfect character of Yahweh, His חסד, His fidelity to the bondkinship, His steadfast adhesion to the purpose of חסד; but His judgments are beyond our explaining or understanding; they are as unfathomable as the Abyss. The glad heart sings on:

Man and beast thou preservest.
How precious is thy חסד, O God!
Men shelter in the shadow of thy wings.

Then there is presented the Source of this exuberant faith:

They gorge on the fatness of thy house;
And of the torrent of thy delights thou givest them to drink.
For with thee is the fountain of life:
In thy light we see light.

In the worshipping fellowship they come on God: they share His joy; they know Him the ever-springing jet of life; in His light they see all life irradiated; He bestows true vision.

Ps 115 is a triumph-song, occasioned by some signal victory over idolatrous foes. To Yahweh is all the glory ascribed. The contrast here is between the hand-made images, motionless, powerless, helpless, and Yahweh, the Creator of the universe, omnific Occupant of the heavens, Bestower of the earth upon men, Help and Shield to nation and priest and convert. The conception of God is seen expanding from national limits towards the universal, from Israel through non-Israelitish adherents (them that fear Yahweh) towards humanity.

Ps 139 is late. It is unique: it is like no other psalm. It shows the universalizing process in its intensive phase. There is no taint of particularism about it. It contains no mention of Israel, Zion, priesthood, or sacrificial cult. It is inwardly, universally human. Just as little has it, with all its suggestions of philosophy, any taint whatever of Greek speculation. There is no abstract thought in it; all is concrete, vivid, personal. The Chief Figure in it is as far removed as possible from anything like Aristotle's *νόησις νοήσεως*. Yahweh is throughout personal; if one may say so, personality to the *n*th power. And it is as personality accompanying, scrutinizing, forestalling personality, that He is presented. Omniscience is implied: He knows and foreknows thought, word, deed, the hidden processes of prenatal life. Omnipresence, in Heaven, earth, and Sheol, is definitely asserted. If the poet takes the wings of the morning, as it flutters over the eastern hills and does not end his flight until he pitches his tent beyond the western wave, even there Yahweh's hand is upon him to grasp and to lead. And then the thoughts of this all-encompassing, all-winnowing Yahweh—no abstractions of the speculative reason, but the living thoughts of the living God—how precious are they; how great are their heads; chapter after chapter of the Divine thought he turns over in his mind, and delights in their priceless value. Ethical content appears in the closing verses, in a truculent assertion of hatred to the enemies of God; and in a request for the scrutiny of his motives:

Search me, and know my heart:
Try me, and know my thoughts.

The introspective note struck at the beginning sounds again at the close.

'Private Vices' and 'Public Benefits.'

By the Very Reverend W. R. Inge, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's.

'From whence come wars and fightings among you? come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?'—Ja 4[1].

In the year 1723 Dr. Bernard Mandeville, a physician, published a book which became famous, called *The Fable of the Bees; or, Private Vices, Public Benefits*. The fable described a hive of bees, who after growing wealthy and great by the practice of fraud and luxury, agreed to turn honest and lost everything. This flippant essay provoked a reply from William Law, the author of the *Serious Call*, one of the most powerful and virile minds that the Church of England has ever produced. Of this reply John Sterling, a competent critic, says that it is 'one of the most remarkable philosophical essays he had ever seen in English.' Law does not argue at length that in the history of nations private vices have not been public benefits. He goes to the root of the matter by attacking Mandeville's thesis that man is only an animal, and moral virtue only an imposture; that human nature is but 'a compound of various passions, which govern him by turns, whether he will or no.' 'The province,' says Law, 'which you have chosen for yourself is to deliver man from the encroachments of virtue and to replace him in the rights and privileges of brutality; to recall him from the giddy heights of rational dignity and angelic likeness to go to grass or wallow in the mire.' Which is the truth? This estimate of human nature or that of the Book of Genesis: 'God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness'—'a declaration of the dignity of man's nature, made long before any of your sagacious moralists had a meeting.' What are we to say about the origin of virtue? 'In one sense it had no origin—that is, there never was a time when it began to be—but it was as much without beginning as truth and goodness, which are in their natures as eternal as God. But moral virtue, if considered as the object of man's knowledge, began with the first man, and was as natural to him as it was natural to man to think and perceive, or feel the difference between pleasure and pain. The reasonableness and fitness of actions themselves is a law to rational beings; nay, it is a law to which even the Divine Nature is subject, for God is necessarily good and just; and it is the will of God that makes moral virtue our law, and obliges us to act reasonably. Here is the noble and Divine origin of moral virtue; it is founded in the immutable relations of things, in the perfections and attributes of God, not in the pride of man, or the craft of cunning politicians. Away then with your idle and profane fancies about the origin of moral virtue. For once turn your eyes to heaven, and dare but own a just and good God, and then you have owned the true origin of religion and moral virtue.'

There are words and phrases here which belong to the eighteenth century and the controversy with the Deists. But Law's position is plain. The moral sense has an absolute sanction, being part of the nature of the God who made the world and what we call the laws of Nature. Morality or virtue is and always has been natural to man, who was made in the image of God; and his social happiness here, no less than his individual happiness hereafter, is bound up with his obedience to those higher impulses which are in truth the law of his being.

The theory that private vices are public benefits has seldom been stated so crudely and offensively as it was by Mandeville. But in its essence it has often been held, defended, and acted upon. It was the source of much of the optimism of nineteenth-century political thought. The business man, it was held, though his one aim in life is to make a fortune for himself or his family, is, by an admirable dispensation of Providence, doing the very best thing for his country and for the progress of mankind. In a State where every one is personally interested in producing and offering what his neighbours want, every one will get what he wants at the lowest price without appealing to those lofty motives which are inoperative in the majority of men. So competition is to produce all the advantages of co-operation, having itself the great advantage of being natural to man; for we all wish to make money, and we do not all wish to help each other.

Thus our grandfathers thought that some private vices were public benefits. The opinion seemed

plausible for a time; that was in fact the time when the nation was expanding most rapidly. But the beneficent consequences of keen competition were in a sense accidental, and were bound to be transitory. It was not realized that the same desire to make money which had created many useful and flourishing private businesses would after a time lead to great combinations aiming at monopolies; that the manufacturer would be swallowed up by the international banker; that the wage-earners would form their own combinations against the capitalist and consumer alike. Our grandfathers regarded competition as a contest in serviceableness; as we see it, it is quite as often a conspiracy of unserviceableness. Private vices and public benefits no longer pull together; they get sadly in each other's way.

Moreover, our grandfathers seldom contemplated that acquisitiveness would organize itself so completely as to turn a whole nation into a gigantic business Trust. Yet this was exactly what was happening in Germany, and it is the logical result of the maxim 'Private vices are public benefits.' The private ambition of one nation was defended as being really a benefit to the whole world which was to be drilled by it into greater efficiency. The Germans, however, knew that when their aims became manifest they would have to fight for them; and they determined to strike first. Hence the recent war. The private vices of nations—their patriotic aggressiveness and inordinate pride—have not proved public benefits; they have almost, if not quite, wrecked our civilization.

The doctrine which inspired Mandeville and incensed William Law has not been accepted without protest. Martineau declared that 'From "each for self" to "each for all" there is *no road*.' And Herbert Spencer pronounced the impressive warning that 'There is no political alchemy which can extract golden conduct from leaden instincts.'

But neither the warnings and protests of good and wise men, nor the terrible breakdown of civilization in the late war, have had any appreciable influence in weakening the widespread belief that through strife and envying, through hatred and malice, through greed and violence, we may arrive at a better social order than we have at present. The advocates of civil war naturally pour out the vials of their wrath against democracy, because it rests on the assumption that there is a common good which all citizens wish to promote, and a common law which all citizens must obey. They are equally hostile to State socialism, which demands a semi-military subordination of the individual to the State. The new doctrinaires assume an irreconcilable antagonism between classes, and hope to establish a new order by giving full scope to this antagonism.

We have not the slightest wish to identify Christianity with any one of the opinions on which good and sensible men are divided. But this particular type of political thought, by whatever name it calls itself, is flatly and absolutely unchristian. It has all the evils of aggressive militarism without any of the redeeming qualities which make soldiering a school of courage, discipline, and self-sacrifice. It tears to pieces the country which we have come to love as we never loved it before. It degrades human nature, and poisons all the relationships which bring men together in their working hours. And surely we must see that it is a short cut to national suicide. How can a house divided against itself ever hope to stand? What bond of union is there even between the various trades which may for a time combine for war against society? How can any good come out of broken contracts, dishonest work, organised terrorism, and callous cruelty?

Was not William Law quite right when he said that the root of the whole evil is an acceptance of human nature at its worst, and a blind hope that somehow or other chaos will evolve order out of itself? If we could not find better texts in the Bible, we might well go back to the Stoics, who bravely maintained that men are framed for co-operation, not for mutual injury, and that the law of Nature sanctions and demands a life of duty, obedience, and service.

What are the good things which we are not ashamed to desire for ourselves and our country? What are the things which we are not ashamed to pray for? In seeking these good things for ourselves or for others, are we driven inexorably in the direction of strife and war? Do we find that the pursuit of these things divides us into jarring and at last warring factions? Do these objects disintegrate a nation, so that it is useless to its friends and contemptible to its enemies?

On the contrary, we know that as soon as we live on the higher plane of our nature, as soon as we remember that we are children of God, redeemed by Christ, and citizens of a better world

than this; as soon as the prayer 'Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done,' comes to life in our minds and shines before our eyes as an ideal and a glorious promise, we are drawn together, irrespective of class and even of nationality. As fellow-workers with God we are all fellow-workers with each other; we have no irreconcilably discrepant interests, because we are all fellow-workmen, bringing, in St. Paul's famous picture, to the building of the Temple of God, the Temple raised on the only possible foundation, Jesus Christ—bringing the diverse materials which are our life's work, in the hope that the Master-Builder will find a use for them, and that they will stand the fire on those Days of Trial, when Christ 'is sifting out the hearts of men before His judgment-seat.'

We are tired of the word 'reconstruction,' but let us dwell upon it for a moment, since it is one of St. Paul's favourite metaphors, as in the passage which was in my mind. We have to rebuild our national house, which we hope is part of the Temple of God, to be built in co-operation by all the nations of the earth. Each of us has to bring a stone, a living stone, as St. Peter says; and these living stones are ourselves, as our characters find expression in our lives. 'Whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men.' 'Not with eyeservice, as men-pleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God.' Are we to be content to bring rotten materials to that building? How can any 'reconstruction' take place under such conditions?

Christ offers us peace instead of war—'Peace on earth, good will to men.' 'Let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to which also ye are called in one body.' 'In His will,' as Dante says in a famous line, 'In His will is our peace.' Peace, which we longed for during the four glorious and terrible years of national conflict; peace, which we have longed for even more ardently through the inglorious and degrading civil troubles of this year; peace is within our reach, and on easy terms. 'If ye be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above.' Believe that human nature is not the mean and brutish thing that it sometimes appears. Believe that we were not meant to hate and devour one another, but to help each other, forgetting all those foolish barriers of class and race and sect which Christ levelled once for all. 'Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid.' Are these words true, or are they not? We know that they are true, so true that we have kept them bedridden in the dormitory of our souls, and have forgotten them. It is time to bring them out. 'Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.'

Recent Foreign Theology.

Christology.

Professor Rade pursues his plan of treating the whole dogmatic field in his own practical and distinctive fashion. This is volume two of the whole work;[1] more accurately, perhaps, part two of volume one. Its subject is the Person and work of our Lord. He studies in order three efforts to read the secret of Christology. First, the Logos Christology, which ends, as he puts it, in a *cul de sac*, from which there is no escape save through the illegitimate bypath of Kenoticism. (This estimate of Kenoticism, I should tend to say, is overmuch preoccupied with the very vulnerable details of especially the earlier systems, without an adequate attempt to get at the *principle* of which they were more or less clumsy applications, but which wins the assent of every Christian heart, viz. the truth that God has stooped down to bless us in His Son, and has done so at infinite cost.) Next, the movement revolving round 'the historic Jesus,' which Rade declares (and proves) has sought to extract from historical research purely religious values which it can never yield. Thirdly, Christological speculation, elaborating the Christ-idea more or less in independence of the gospel record. His observations on the Logos Christology, though in some degree familiar, are weighty

[1] *Glaubenslehre:* ii. 'Christus,' von Martin Rade (L. Klotz Verlag, Gotha; 1926; Mk.4).

and pointed, as well as reminiscent of criteria which a careful study of New Testament faith can never fail to suggest. He enumerates three chief reasons why the *Leben Jesu* movement fell off. (1) The rise of the eschatological reading of Jesus' self-consciousness and message; (2) the appearance of novels with the historical Jesus as their central figure; (3) the currency of the legend that Jesus had never lived at all, a legend gravely offered as serious history. All these forced people to ask whether faith can rightly be asked to submit to the tyranny of technical scholarship. In Rade's chapter on speculative thought, he gives a page or two to Rittelmeyer; an evidence of the progress made in modern Germany by the Christian Theosophical Movement.

Throughout Rade has set himself to elicit the genuine beliefs about our Lord which prevail, and do saving work, in the living Church. That is an echo of Schleiermacher, with reservations; but it hardly appears to be any more valid as a definitive method than in its earlier form, and in point of fact Rade does not hesitate to indulge his critical faculty on current tenets, when they call for scrutiny. This would hold especially of his study of Atonement doctrine. Here he sketches past thought very briefly. He points out that there must be a reason—and a good reason—why it has become much less frequent than before to speak of the *merits* of Christ; believers put their infinite sense of debt to the Redeemer in another form now. 'Merit,' it is perceived, is a concept of extremely doubtful standing in ethics. Rade speaks with fine warmth and insight of Christ's solidarity with His people in life and death. He holds, as Bushnell did, that love and vicariousness are inseparable, and admirably observes that 'the doctrine of vicarious suffering is by many people wrongly confused with the doctrine of satisfaction. But these are two quite different ideas, which do not in the least involve each other.' We are shown, too, that it is idle to deny to Christ's work all effect upon God. Did it not have the effect of satisfying His fatherly heart? Had it no value for God that His Son should offer Himself as the vessel and instrument of His Father's grace? Who will venture to deny this joy to the Creator and Ruler of men?

The same richly and profoundly Christian spirit pervades a brief treatment of the Lord's triumph over death. Rade deprecates, I think justly, the tendency in quite recent theology to do too much honour to death by making it the chief, and not only the last, enemy. Christ has put death in its place, under His feet; and it is Eastern, not Western, to make the gospel mainly a message of hope for immortality. In his discussion of the Easter narratives, he would have gained, surely, by recognizing frankly that 'resurrection' is a word relative to the body, and that if no physical triumph took place, we really need a new term.

Though in certain ways more popular in style than other systems, Rade's book gives a very full account of the orthodox background of present-day Church thought. Older views are stated with the most scrupulous fairness. No theologian known to me can use the classics of the hymn-book with such doctrinal effect. He has a strong communal sense—as he puts it, we cannot have Jesus without having the disciples too. Also he is invariably interesting and lucid in every line and paragraph; he lacks, to use his own phrase, 'the charism of obscurity.'

By this time it is unnecessary to dwell upon the merits of Otto's well-known book,[1] so admirably translated into English three years since, by Mr. J. W. Harvey. Already Mr. Harvey's rendering has reached a fourth impression; there have also been translations into Swedish and Spanish, while others into Italian and Japanese are under way. Since the first edition of *Das Heilige* appeared in 1917, Professor Otto has collected a good many appendices, sometimes of great doctrinal interest, in a separate volume, together with various new ones, so that we are now fairly well equipped for the study of what even its unfriendly critics must allow to be one of the most stimulating and captivating works that have recently been submitted to the theological public. This new German edition, the fourteenth in nine years, has been revised and added to; among the additions are to be found some unusually apt quotations confirmatory of the author's findings. It has been beautifully printed and bound. Everything about the volume is attractive except the hideous picture of Durgā, a Bengal goddess, which faces p. 84. Still, 'there are many voices in the world, and none of them is without signification.' In future editions—for this can scarcely be the last—Professor Otto might

[1] *Das Heilige*, von Rudolf Otto (L. Klotz Verlag, Gotha; 14th Ed., 1926; Mk.5).

do well to caution some of his more thoughtless admirers, who have inclined to play off his insistence on the alogical or non-rational elements of religion against the ethical quality of Christianity. Except for a few sentences in his supplementary volume, mentioned above, I have not found anything in Otto himself to encourage this; but it is a distinct peril for less balanced minds.

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

Edinburgh.

Varia.

THEO BAUER has discussed in *Die Ostkanaanäer*,[1] the much debated hypothesis of the so-called 'Amorite' empire, of which in the English-speaking world Professor A. C. Clay has been the most brilliant protagonist. This empire is supposed to have come into being in the west of Babylon and Mesopotamia about the beginning of the third millennium B.C. Bauer flatly denies the existence of this empire: he even avoids the word 'Amorite' in this connexion on account of its ambiguity, as its connotation changed markedly in the course of the centuries, and prefers to speak of the Eastern Canaanites, or at least of the language they spoke, as East Canaanite. He rests his case upon a very minute examination of the extant proper names found in contracts, letters, seals, and name-lists of the period in question, and he follows this up with a grammatical sketch of East Canaanite deduced from these names, in which he offers a suggestive comparison with Hebrew. Considering the paucity of the material, the results are necessarily meagre; for example, there is no plural, and no certain case of a perfect tense; but there is an interesting analogy with the Hebrew ו and י *compaginis* (cf. שמואל). Bauer reaches the conclusion that the language may be regarded as a dialect of Canaanite and represents an earlier stage of Hebrew. The proper names seem to him to suggest that the people who spoke it came from the country east of the Tigris.

In a volume[2] of one thousand one hundred and eleven pages crowded with detail which attests the almost incredible industry of its author, Professor Fritz Hommel discusses the ethnology and geography of the Ancient East. The countries selected for special treatment are Babylonia, Arabia, and East and North Africa—more particularly Egypt, but the nature of the discussion leads it over occasionally into adjacent lands. Themes of many kinds come up for treatment—the migrations, languages, religions, cultures, etc., of the Ancient East, and exhaustive information about ancient towns, canals, districts, and their administration is found here in bewildering profusion. It is impossible in a brief notice to give even a remotely adequate idea of the contents of a book whose index alone occupies sixty-eight pages of three columns each. Students of Oriental antiquity and not least of the Old Testament will gratefully welcome a work which gathers together so many recondite facts about ancient civilization and presents them in a living synthesis.

Dr. E. L. Dietrich[3] has carefully examined the history and the grammar of the much discussed phrase שוב שבות, collecting and discussing in the light of the versions all the passages in which the phrase occurs. He argues that the noun was originally שְׁבוּת, not שְׁבוּת, which is due to a later confusion with (ת)שְׁבִי, when the word was wrongly understood as 'captivity'; and further that the difficult transitive שוב is perhaps a simplification of the more correct הֵשִׁיב. Passages like Job 42^{10}, La 2^{14}, and Ezk 16^{53} (of Sodom) show that the phrase had originally nothing to do with captivity or exile. It is really, Dietrich believes, a technical eschatological term, possibly of foreign origin, and is used to indicate the 'restoration of the good old time.' This is a lucid and valuable discussion. On p. 26 correct Hes 89^{25} to 39^{25}, and on p. 55 παλανὸς to παλαιὸς.

Professor Hölscher has thrown out some interesting suggestions on the origin of Jewish eschatology in a lecture[4] in which he criticises previous attempts, all of which he rejects, to explain it as a prophetic transformation of a national politic hope, or to

[1] *Die Ostkanaanäer, eine philologisch-historische Untersuchung über die Wanderschicht der sogenannten 'Amoriter' in Babylonien* (Verlag der 'Asia Major,' Leipzig).

[2] *Ethnologie und Geographie des Alten Orients*, von Fritz Hommel (C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, München; M.48).

[3] שוב שבות *Die endzeitliche Wiederherstellung bei den Propheten* (Töpelmann, Giessen; Mk.4).

[4] *Die Ursprünge der jüdischen Eschatologie* (Töpelmann, Giessen; Pf.70).

derive it from Babylon, Egypt, or Persia. Persian eschatology, he believes, influenced Jewish, but not powerfully till the Greek period. Following Mowinckel, he finds the origin of eschatology in Israel's own cult, more particularly in the harvest festival which each year marked afresh the accession of Jahweh to His throne; or to be more correct, this is not yet eschatology, for in the cult Jahweh is already present and already King, so that His coming in the future does not need to be an object of hope. But Amos (5^{18-20}) by separating 'the day of Jahweh' from the cult may be said to have taken the first step towards an eschatology. It was the Exile, however, interrupting the cult as it did, that centred hope upon the future: in Deutero-Isaiah we see the old liturgical songs transposed to another key. A valuable discussion.

By a series of short but carefully selected extracts from the Avestā, Professor K. L. Geldner [1] has made it easy for all who are interested in Zoroastrianism to enter into direct contact with its sources and to form their own impressions. The first part contains the *Gāthās,* which comprise the original words of Zarathustra; the second part represents the later ecclesiastical teaching. Together they form an admirable manual in which each paragraph has appropriate headings and the comment (in footnotes) is reduced to the barest minimum. The extracts deal with the Kingdom of God, the good spirits, Zarathustra's temptation, the conflict between Ormazd and Ahriman, death, resurrection, etc., and they furnish a brief but living picture of the religion whose ever-recurring emphasis was upon good words, good deeds, and good thoughts.

'Caliph' is defined in 'The Concise Oxford Dictionary' as 'Mohammedan chief civil and religious ruler.' Professor R. Tschudi's lecture on *Das Chalifat,*[2] which traces the Caliphate through its long and chequered history down to its abolition in March 1924, defends the thesis that, whatever the practice may at times have been, the theory and even the law of Islam recognize only the political and not the spiritual authority of the Caliph. The Caliphate is not really comparable to the papacy. The lecture has a special interest in view of recent happenings in the Muhammadan world. Tschudi raises the question whether Islam could exist without the Caliphate, and answers it in the affirmative.

In a fascinating lecture Professor D. Paul Volz [3] traces the 'demonic' element in Jahweh through the Old Testament. He finds this not only in stories like the smiting of Uzzah or the sacrifice of Isaac, but even in the prophets, in Ecclesiastes, and especially in Job. In the view that the ethical element in the character of Jahweh has tended to obscure its mysterious, uncanny, 'holy' quality, he recalls Otto. It is this demonic quality that explains the 'fear' that is so pervasive a feature of Old Testament religion; and this same quality appears in the elect men, like Moses and Elijah, who are the instruments of Jahweh's purpose. This mysterious quality is perhaps connected with Jahweh's primitive association with the desert, peopled as it was with so many eerie forces. Their ultimate absorption in Jahweh, while it invested Him with this curious incalculable quality, was a contribution of the first importance to monotheism, which, with all the difficulties to which it gave rise —for Jahweh is now the author of everything, evil (Am 3^{6}) as well as good—was a vastly worthier solution of the world problem than the easier dualism. It is the great achievement of the prophets to have moralized this incalculable factor in Jahweh and to have brought it into the service of an ethical religion: 'the holy God shows his holiness in righteousness' (Is 5^{16}). But to the end the mystery remains, revealing itself in its most poignant form in the Cross. This unusually interesting and provocative lecture furnishes the key to many perplexities in the Old Testament, and sets its whole development in a fresh light.

A fine sketch of the problem of suffering in the Old Testament,[4] marked by insight and religious feeling, was presented by Professor Hans Schmidt to a theological conference at Giessen. The solutions or rather suggestions of a solution in Old Testament are (i) that it is retribution due to guilt —originally connected with the cult, but moralized by the prophets. This may lead to a utilitarian conception of religion (Mal 3^{14}). (ii) It may be

[1] *Die Zoroastrische Religion* (*Das Avestā*) (Mohr, Tübingen; M.2.50).

[2] Mohr, Tübingen; M.1.20.

[3] *Das Dämonische in Jahwe* (Mohr, Tübingen; M.1.20).

[4] *Gott und das Leid im Alten Testament* (Töpelmann, Giessen; Mk.2).

disciplinary; the successive catastrophes in Am 4^{6-11} should have had the effect of inducing the people to 'return unto Me.' (iii) It may be simply an inexplicable mystery: this, and not the wisdom and friendliness of the world-system, is the teaching of Job 38 f. (iv) It may be designed for large ends beyond the interests of the individual sufferer, as the stern experiences of Joseph or Hosea suggest; it is for others' sake. (v) It may have, as it were, a mystical value, and lead to a deeper experience of the companionship of God (cf. Ps 73). (vi) God Himself shares the sufferings of men (Hos 11^{1-4}). Schmidt follows Mowinckel in regarding the Servant of Jahweh in the songs of Dt.–Is. as the prophet himself. There are interesting suggestions on the text of the difficult Job 19^{25-28}, notably מִבְּשָׂרִי (for *from my flesh*), 'God will be *my bringer of good tidings*.'

The Rev. Gottfried Kuhn, in his view of Ecclesiastes,[1] does not follow in the footsteps of recent critics. So far from regarding it as the expression of unmitigated pessimism, the book is to him 'the vestibule to the New Testament,' and the writer of it is a true son and leader of Israel, whose word in 5^{1} could hardly be bettered as a summary of prophetic teaching. Just as for Kuhn the Shulammite in the Song of Songs (6^{13}) is the symbol of Wisdom speaking to the intimate friends of God who are 'far ben,' so Koheleth (also a feminine word) is that Wisdom addressing the multitude, who are concerned only with the things that are 'under the sun.' His theme is the vanity of all things *apart from God* (cf. 1 Jn $2^{16f.}$); the other side of this—the complete satisfaction that men may find in God—is hinted at rather than developed, in accordance with his own principle that as God is in heaven and we on earth, our words should be few (5^{2}). This view enables Kuhn to retain the happier and more hopeful passages which many critics relegate to interpolators; for nothing is a 'vanity' to the man who gratefully accepts it as a gift of God and a revelation of His love. This general exposition of the mind of Ecclesiastes is followed by a brief discussion, which illustrates his thesis, of the consecutive sections of the book.

A fine appreciation of the Book of Daniel, both on the critical and the religious side, is offered by Professor Walter Baumgartner in *Das Buch Daniel*.[2] He discusses its date, its narratives, its visions, its apocalyptic, and its religious value for its own time and for ours. Each of the narratives is believed to have once formed a complete whole and to have circulated independently; and, taken together, they point to the Persian period, so that they are older than the Book in its present form. Similarly, the basis of the vision in ch. 7 seems to be pre-Maccabæan, but later to have been worked over, after the writer's experience of Antiochus. The religious value of the Book is well set forth. 'What arrests us is the keenness with which it grasps and brings out the contrast between the powers of the world and the kingdom of God; the conviction that all world-history, so far from being the sport of meaningless accident, is moving on in giant cycles which only the eye of faith can follow to a goal which is God's; and the rock-firm confidence in the coming of this new order. These are in essence the great thoughts of the prophets. . . . In times of persecution this book has brought courage and comfort, in times of collapse and confusion it has directed the gaze to the coming and the permanent.'

Dr. Martin Thilo, who has distinguished himself by original work on The Song of Songs, Job, and Ecclesiastes, has broken new ground in the discussion of the chronology of the Book of Daniel.[3] He regards the date in the opening verse (605 B.C.) as regulative of the chronology of the book. Seventy years from that date (9^{2}), the period of the Chaldæan sovereignty, would, in the author's manner of reckoning, bring us to 537, just a little after the capture of Babylon. On the other hand, sixty-two weeks of years, *i.e.* four hundred and thirty-four years, *starting from* 605 would bring us to 173 (605 to 537 = 70, and 536 to 173 inclusive = 364: 70 + 364 = 434, *i.e.* 62 week-years). This is the date involved in the reference to Onias III. in 9^{26}. The 70 week-years Thilo regards as part of a traditional apocalyptic scheme; and the failure of modern exegetes to find an even approximately satisfactory explanation for the 62 week-years has been due to the fact that they wrongly start the computation of the whole period from 586, and of the week-years from 537 (*i.e.* 586 minus 49), thus leaving nearly

[1] *Erklärung des Buches Koheleth* (Töpelmann, Giessen; M.2.60).

[2] Töpelmann, Giessen; M.1.

[3] *Die Chronologie des Danielbuches* (A. Schmidt, Bonn; M.2.50).

seventy years unaccounted for. The explanation is certainly ingenious, and it meets the difficulty felt by exegetes, though at the cost of interpreting Jeremiah's seventy years literally and the 'apocalyptic' seventy years as week-years.

Old Testament students who desire to steer their way intelligently through that labyrinthine literature will find exactly what they want in Professor George Beer's brief conspectus of its contents.[1] It is a lucid presentation, book by book and section by section, of the contents, literary structure and date, as these appear to the eyes of the moderate critic. The book is not an introduction to the Old Testament, but it would be a valuable adjunct to an introduction, and to those who are not technical students it would be a useful introduction to Old Testament science, furnishing as it does an easy initiation into its literary problems, and revealing the course of its literary history.

An interesting feature of the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*[2] is the friendly welcome it gives, under the editorship of Professor Gressmann, to articles in English by British and American scholars. Last year, for example, Professor Welch contributed an article on a subject which he has made peculiarly his own, 'When was the Worship of Israel centralized at the Temple?' and another on 'The Death of Josiah,' while W. L. Wardle discusses the origins of Hebrew monotheism. There is a very friendly review by the editor of Dr. Moffatt's translation of the Old Testament, and also of 'The People and the Book,' the series of essays by Old Testament scholars edited by Professor Peake. Gressmann remarks that British scholars have the peculiar gift of keeping in continual contact with the practical religious life of their time. R. H. Pfeiffer, in an interesting article on Edomitic wisdom, suggests that some parts of the Old Testament which seem to reflect a pessimistic or agnostic attitude to life (cf. Pr 30. 31^{1-9}) have been influenced by, or derived from, Edom, whose pessimism 'is, in a measure, the result of the depressing environment.'

The most important article in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* is a long and searching criticism by Sebastian Merkle of the literature connected with Bellarmine and a plea for the authoritative disclosure of original sources, on the ground that the interests not only of truth but of the Church are in the end better served by an unvarnished tale than by fulsome panegyrics or the suppression of inconvenient facts. Merkle charges not only the older biographers, but some of the more recent who claim to be working on scientific principles, with cherishing in their historical work the fanciful conceptions of holiness which characterized the writers of the more or less legendary lives of the saints.

J. E. McFadyen.

Glasgow.

[1] *Kurze Übersicht über den Inhalt der Alttestamentlichen Schriften* (Mohr, Tübingen; M.4.80).

[2] Zweiter Band, 1925; Dritter Band, 1926 (Töpelmann, Giessen).

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Home.[1]

'I will arise, and go to my father.'—Lk 15^{18}.

Are you one of the children who are always asking questions? 'Mummy, why this?' and 'Daddy, how that?' If so, you must be a bit of a nuisance sometimes to grown-ups, you know, chipping in like that when they want to talk about something else. Still, to keep asking questions is the way to learn. And nowadays every one does it. How? Why? What? Where? they keep on saying; and so because we ask questions, we are learning heaps of things. People wanted to know about the birds—where they go when they leave us—and so on. And so they put rings on some young ones they snared, with a request on them that, if any one happened to catch that bird, he would let it go again, and send word where it had been found. One young bird marked in Scotland was seen over in Norway a few months later; and another in Czecho-Slovakia. And a young gull from Northumberland turned up, where do you

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

think? In far away Newfoundland of all places. Young though it was, it had struggled against the storms over the wide Atlantic, and had reached the other side! What did it do when it was tired on the long journey? Did it poise itself on the huge rushing billows, and get rocked sound asleep by that fearsome cradle? Any way, there it was, safely over. But all birds come home again, back to the place from which they went. Swallows may fly to Africa, but next year they will rest under the same old eaves. Some gulls come every year to where I spend my holiday, as far from the sea as you can be in Scotland, and on a little islet in a little loch among the heather there, year after year, bring up their family. And then off they go; but always they come back. For something pulls them home.

And it's the same with fishes. People are marking them too, we are told. Some time ago one was caught and let off again at the mouth of the Ythan, away up in the North. And by and by they hooked it in the heart of Perthshire. It had swum all that long, long way, had passed the Don, the Dee, the Tay, and then turned up the Forth, and up the Teith. Because that was its home, it seems, and fish like to go for their honeymoon back to the place where they were born. That something pulls them also home.

And it's the same with men and women. Over all the earth they wander from this little island of ours and live away for years and years. Yet they like to come back, to see the place where they lived as boy and girl, and where their Mother used to be. That queer something pulls them too.

You know the feeling, don't you? It's lovely going for a holiday, and everything is splendid, and every one so kind. And yet sometimes you get a little bit homesick, isn't it so? When you climb into bed, and at home Mother would be tucking you in and she is not there; or when you think of what they are all doing and you aren't sharing in it. That makes you feel lonesome. And glorious though the holiday is, home's best, and you wish you were back.

Ah, but you have another Home, didn't you know? Look at the ninetieth psalm. An old scholar thought it must have been written by Moses. They say he was quite wrong. But it was a bonnie guess. Think of those people blown about the wilderness for forty years, sick of it often, wishing they had some place to call their own, standing upon the borders of other people's lands and watching them, all with a home to go to every night. And they themselves had none. But yes, thought the old poet, yes, we have. Our Home is God. And He is your Home too. And Home is always far the nicest, isn't it?

This stupid boy thought not, was tired of home. It was so dull, he said. He was fed up with it, and off he flung to have a good time, and be his own master. But he, too, tired of that, got sick of the far country, felt that something pulling him back to his own real place, just like the fishes and the birds. I'm going Home, he said one day, and started.

And you, perhaps, have wandered a long way from God. You have been sulky and cross and crabbed and horrid and mean; have got far, far from home. And aren't you tired of it, and sorry for it all, and homesick to be back again. Ah! Home is far the nicest, and always it's where we're with God that we are happiest. If I were you, I would send Him a telegram, a little prayer, 'Father, dear, I am coming Home'; and I would set off now, out of that dull, lonely land of sulks and crabbedness.

When you came home from your holiday there was Dad at the station, and he ran to you and was so very glad to see you, wasn't he?—though you had clean forgotten to write him all the time you were away. And when this stupid boy got back, his father was so pleased to see him that he, too, ran to him, threw his arms about him, crying out happily, 'Oh! laddie, laddie, it's fine to have you home again.'

And, however horrid to God you have been, that's what He will do to you if you go Home.

Brother Juniper.[1]

'And to another one talent.'—Mt 25^{15}.

Seven hundred years ago Saint Francis died, and this month Christians all over the world will be celebrating his memory, and talking of that 'little poor man of Assisi' who by the sheer power of his goodness brought light into many dark places in the thirteenth century. Men turned from evil to goodness; they built beautiful churches and monasteries; they went singing all over Western Europe because they came under his spell, and even now there is music in his name. Indeed, it

[1] By the Reverend R. Strong, M.A., B.Litt., Norwich.

has been said of him that in very many ways he was more like our Master than any man who has ever lived. There was music in his own heart, and so he found music everywhere; he had so much of the love of God in himself that love cast out all fear, as it always does. No wonder he found the world beautiful and could always sing:

Praise be to Thee, my Lord, with all Thy creatures.

What was there in the world to fear when God loved him, and he could talk of Brother Sun, Brother Fire, Sister Sleep, Sister Owl, and all the rest. Why, he had brothers and sisters everywhere.

Just because Saint Francis was so wonderful in goodness and charm, we may sometimes do less than justice to some of the humbler men who gathered about him and helped him in his work. They also were faithful men, and we believe Saint Francis himself would have desired that their names should be remembered. One of them used to annoy as well as amuse him, but whether Francis was annoyed, or amused, he never failed to love him. His name was Brother Juniper. I am glad that when Mr. Laurence Housman wrote 'The Little Plays of Saint Francis' he made one play all about Brother Juniper. Brother Juniper was not a very wise man, and if any of you have not gained as many prizes this last term as you desired, it is quite likely you will say, 'This is the saint for me. Some of the work of the world is done by ordinary folk after all.' Not that I am going to ask you to take Brother Juniper as a model. If you made some of his mistakes, there would be trouble at home; and besides, he himself would have been horrified at the idea of anybody taking him as a model. Whatever else might be true of him, nobody ever doubted his humility. Indeed, if anybody had called him a fool, the chances are that he would have said, 'Glory be to God, that's true.' You couldn't hurt him that way. I have started with a text about the one-talent man because I believe that with all his failings he had a talent, and a very big one, but he himself wouldn't have called himself even a one-talent man. As Mr. Housman has made him say in his play:

> When I weep, men laugh that I do it so ill, and when I laugh, they are like to weep, I do it with so ugly a face. But God loves me, and whether I laugh or weep, He knows what I mean.

The brothers often had to complain about him; they said he was such a special sort of fool that nobody knew what he would do next. What queer stories have come down to us about his blunders. They say that once he cooked rabbits for dinner without skinning them first: he thought the skin would just peel off easily during the cooking. Can you wonder that the monks grumbled when they missed their dinners because of his foolishness? As for generosity, there was so much brotherly love in him that any kind of sorrow was pain to him, and he would give away all he had to relieve another's suffering. His brother monks began to think it wasn't safe for him to possess anything at all, for it was more than likely that the first poor person who came along might get it all. There was a great stir once when they found that a new altar cloth with lovely silver bells on it had been spoiled because he had cut off the silver bells and given them to a poor woman whose husband was in prison for theft. When they lectured him for this, all he could say was, 'Be not distressed about these bells, for I have given them to a poor woman that had the greatest need of them, and here they were of no use at all, save only for vain, worldly pomp.'

With all his blunders, however, people at last began to see what Francis had always seen, the beauty of his soul. Once when he had become famous as a saint, he had to make a journey to Rome, and many people set out from Rome to meet him. As he got near the city he saw two children playing see-saw. What did the saint do but sit down on one end of the log, and play with the children, getting as much fun out of it as they did. The people were greatly surprised, and some of them shocked, no doubt; they didn't expect a saint like this. The charming old story says: 'And Brother Juniper paid little heed to their salutations, their reverence and their waiting for him, but took much pains with his see-sawing.' I'm afraid pictures of the saints are sometimes rather dull affairs, but there was nothing dull about our saint. He wasn't any less a saint because he enjoyed games, and surely God rejoices when His children are as happy as sandboys.

The fact about Juniper which always delighted Francis was that his blunders were always of the mind and never of the heart. It was worth while to have about him a simple-hearted man showing men the love of God in the jolliest, most

human way possible. Well might Francis say, 'Thou hast great wealth, Juniper, for thou hast charity.' I fancy that One whom Francis called Lord would say, 'Loving much, thou art both wise and rich. Enter into the joy of the Lord.'

The Christian Year.

Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity.

Antagonistic Fires.

'Through faith . . . quenched the violence of fire.'—Heb 11[33. 34].

1. The writer of these words is reviewing the exploits of faith. He looks back over the wonderful road of his nation's history, and the beacons of faith are so many and so resplendent they seem like a land of unbroken light. It is like as when one stands on the Calton Hill of Edinburgh in the darkness and looks along Princes Street; the separated street-lamps appear to run together, and the radiance is continuous and unbroken. The men and women of faith make a cheerful history. The writer sees their shining triumphs everywhere. Faith makes conquests in every sort of circumstance, mastering them all, and compelling even the most hostile to pay tribute. Yes, faith has even quenched the violence of fire. In the *fires of martyrdom* the faithful in Christ have conquered their pains. They have scarcely felt the flame. Cranmer bathed his hand in the fire as if he were bathing it in a mountain stream. He mastered it even while it destroyed him. His spirit dominated it, and stayed its violence at the frontiers of the soul. And this is the secret—we can only feel what reaches the central realm of consciousness. Look at Stephen while he was being stoned. We are permitted to look into his consciousness. 'I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man sitting on the right hand of God.' That infilling glory swallowed up the energies of his consciousness, and left no dribbling remnant to receive and entertain the pangs of death. By faith Stephen destroyed the violence of the stoning. The body-house was dissolving; the spiritual house was full of God.

2. But there are other fires whose violence can be quenched by robust and positive faith. There is the *fire of destructive passion.* Faith in God can destroy its violence and can even quench the unclean flame. And faith does it in a very simple and effective way. The best way to put out a fire is to withdraw everything that is inflammable. And fires of a spiritual order resolve themselves into a question of fuel. 'Make no provision for the flesh to obey the lusts thereof.' That is the remedy of an empty wood-house. Think of that word of our Lord. 'The prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me.' There was not a bit of fuel about on which the Evil One could light an unclean fire. Not a bit of idle thought! No loose imagination! No illicit dream!

3. And then there is the *fire of destructive temper.* It is a wonderful thing to see a fiery temper subdued by faith, and it has been done a million times. But let it be remembered that when God subdues this kind of fire it does not mean that any executive forces in life are destroyed. The energy of life is not lost; it is only transformed. It is a conversion of forces, and what used to manifest itself in a violent temper now reveals itself in passion of a nobler kind. It is one thing to have a destructive fire breaking out in the parlour; it is quite another thing to have the same fire shut up in a stove in the basement, and distributing genial and healthy heat to every part of the house. The violent is transformed into the gentle, but the gentleness is just distributed violence, and none of the original power is lost. And this transformation is wrought by faith which relates us to Him who is the great Transformer, and who can purify and distribute the force of a bad temper, and change it into a fervent servant of the soul.

4. And what about the *fire of destructive gossip*? And how much there is about! And it is difficult to escape the flame! But the very detachment which faith gives to a life endows it with wonderful security. First of all, such a life dislikes the gossip, and it is a great preservative to have a healthy dislike. A splendid repulsion is a fine defence. A mean gossiper soon withdraws his flame if he encounters wet wood. And that is just what faith does. It gives a sort of wet-wood welcome to the fiery darts, and the sender finds no fun in the business. It was this wet-wood welcome which drove Satan away when he sought to allure the Lord. 'And Satan departed from him for a season, and behold, angels came and ministered unto him.'[1]

[1] J. H. Jowett, *Life in the Heights*, 235.

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Wedding Garment.

'Friend, how camest thou in hither not having a wedding-garment?'—Mt 22^{12}.

Communion with God has rarely been reckoned an easy thing. In primitive religion it was usually bound up with the belief that some rite must be carefully performed, or some gift duly offered, by the participant. For all its limitations and extravagances, sacrifice stamped this elementary sense of requirement upon the conscience of the human race. The ritual of the altar was not invariably favourable to spirituality, or even to morality, but it had the virtue of maintaining upon the whole a widespread conviction that kinship with God was not a matter-of-fact relation which required no special effort from men.

With the change of the centre of gravity from ritual to spirit came a new peril—or, at least, a new phase of moral peril—that of slackness and presumption. The very inwardness of the gospel was made to justify an easy-going temper. The abolition of outward sacrifices by Jesus Christ tended, in some natures, to relax the need of reverent care and thought, especially as the requirements were now shifted to the sphere of the will and conscience, where self-deception is much more easy than in the punctilious discharge of ritual or routine. Men often forget that the more inward a demand becomes the keener is its edge. It is harder to make sure of truth in the inward parts and of moral purity than to offer the requisite number of animals, or to go on a pilgrimage. We may deceive ourselves about the one class of requirements, we cannot about the other. Thus, while the first difficulty of the gospel is to be taken at all, the next is to be taken seriously, upon the terms and conditions of God Himself.

Jesus anticipated this danger. Or rather, He found it already among some of His contemporaries. He spoke this little parable to people who were prone to be cool and complacent in their new attitude towards God. 'The kingdom of heaven is like unto a certain king, which made a marriage for his son. . . . And when the king came in to see the guests, he saw there a man which had not on a wedding garment.'[1]

What is the garment, the absence of which is perceptible to the King alone? We are told that it is the righteousness of Christ. George Fox said, 'The righteousness of Christ is the spiritual man's own livery.' How did St. Paul define the wedding garment? 'Put off,' he says, 'the old man which is corrupt, according to the deceitful lusts, and be renewed in the spirit of your minds; and put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.' The wedding garment, then, is not assumed from without, it is evolved from within; its germ is implanted in all men, in man's inmost spiritual self; it is the Kingdom of Heaven within; it must be born 'from above,' from heaven, from the heaven within, quickened into life by the heaven above, fed and nourished by the heaven around, which is the Divine humanity of Jesus, accessible in prayer, sacrament, and meditation, and by whose presence the life is enfolded. Watch the peacock butterfly spreading his gorgeous wings to the sun. Whence came that resplendent wedding garment? The King gave it him from above, from within; He did not impute it, but impart it. But the butterfly was not always thus; the germ of the jewelled robe lay hid in the dingy caterpillar that once he was: he evolved it himself by simple obedience to the law of his life; all the caterpillar nature slowly ministering to the butterfly nature he lived it out, and it automatically clothed upon him. If we could imagine a caterpillar taking its place amongst butterflies with its gem-like robe unevolved, we have a parable of a child of God in the presence of the King, with his new man, his spiritual self, unevolved, and his old man with its carnal desires and deceitful lusts monopolizing him.

Now two important considerations seem to follow from this interpretation of the wedding garment.

1. The question which we have repeatedly to ask ourselves is this: Do we know that God's nature, the mystic Christ, dwells in us? Do we know that Incarnation is not an isolated fact in one perfect man, but a universal principle in all men? St. Paul, in this morning's Epistle, says 'be filled with the Spirit'; in other words, let your wedding garment evolve till it transfigures you. The Spirit, the Immanence of God, is the involved factor of the wedding garment which has to be evolved. It is the Spirit, the real man within us, that alone recognizes the Fatherhood. Why do we dare to address the unthinkable creative intensity as Abba, Father? Only because our innermost

[1] J. Moffatt, *Reasons and Reasons*, 141.

being is, in essential nature, one with God. 'Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his son (or the Mystic Christ) into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.'

Do we know experimentally the truth of Paul's words, 'There is one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all'; and if this profound interior reality has been even partially recognized by us, does it affect our lives, do we use it in our troubles?

For example, have we ever, in a time of pain or sickness or sorrow or temptation, detached the conscious mind from external circumstances and forced it into temporary oneness with this indwelling Spirit which is the Immanence of God, affirming again and again, 'Christ is in me, He is my life, my strength, my victory, my peace'?

Let us make a real effort to take this transcendent fact of the Immanence of God out of the region of intellectual acceptance, and make it a real sense-experience.

2. Granted that the Parable of the Wedding Garment implies that the great aim of every one of Abba Father's children should be to obtain the consciousness of an indwelling God, what would be the result? We would begin at once to be more useful in the world, because we will be set free from isolated individuality. It is only when we have begun to discover, in the silence of our own souls, that the Lord Jesus, whom we know objectively, and worship as Divine, is the manifestation in perfection of the mystic Christ, the Logos, in ourselves and in all men, that we enter into that state of love and disinterested helpfulness referred to by St. Paul when he said, 'No man liveth to himself.'

The moment we know our oneness with the Father, and so with all His children, we ought to realize that the Soul of the Universe realizes Himself through us, and manifests Himself through us. When Philip asked Jesus to show him the Father, the Lord said, 'Look at me, watch me, the Father in me doeth the works, the Father expresses himself through me.' And He said, 'As my Father sent me, even so send I you.'

Let us carry that thought with us as we move in our daily sphere, in family life, business life, pleasure life, ministering life. He who is quietly co-operating with the wedding garment forming with him (St. Paul calls it having 'Christ formed within us') becomes a creator of happiness, a diffuser of love, an inspirer of nobility, a channel of grace, a stimulator of the moral life of the race, and though his name may never be heard of as prominent in any great moral reform, he will leave the world better than he found it, because as a son of man, living in conscious union with Abba Father, he has had 'power on earth to put away sin.'[1]

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Last Stand of Faith.

'And they answered and said to the king, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thine hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.'—Dn 3^{16-18}.

The Book of Daniel is a story with a purpose. It was written to steady the hearts of patriotic Jews who were passing through one of the severest persecutions for their faith that ever men have passed through. There is no need to dwell on the circumstances of the time when it was written, even though we knew the precise date. The stage is set for any period of time, for every trial of faith has the same elements. There is always, for instance, the golden image. Where will you find a better symbol of the material world and all its glittering appeal to the human heart? And there is always a burning fiery furnace—the threat of loss or suffering for those who will spurn the worship of the world and follow conscience. It is a picture of the eternal temptation, which comes in many different forms, to give ourselves to the things that are seen, to money and fashion and what men call the solid realities, and fling away our faith in the unseen, which in the eyes of men looks merely so much folly. That temptation is the crux of religion. The final question of our loyalty to God is not intellectual, though we may persuade ourselves it is so. God meets us, not with a problem for the mind, but with a moral challenge in actual life. The question really is, whether we shall bow down our manhood before the appeal of pleasure or sense and adopt the selfish standards of the world, or whether we shall be true to the inward voices of our souls and trust them as the whisper of God. That choice meets us all in small things as in great, and it meets us time and again. We may settle

[1] B. Wilberforce, *Steps in Spiritua Growth*, 168.

the question once for all in what we call the choice of Christ, and ever after it is easier; like a man going along a road with a fixed goal, we have settled our direction, and it is merely a matter of going on. But even so, life meets us every now and then, as it did Jesus, with some crisis where we have to reaffirm our faith and say to ourselves whether we are going on.

The message of this story and the picture of these three men give us the right position and the final answer. Their stand is the stand of faith with its back to the wall, and theirs is the one stand which cannot be shaken. There are three stages in it.

1. To begin with, they did not shrink from the choice or try to evade the issue. 'We are not careful to answer thee in this matter.' They were clever men, and if they had cared to use their eloquence they might have found a way of getting out of the trap without either publicly denying their God or doing any disrespect to the golden image. Nor were they going to do any juggling with their own consciences to bow down to the image, for instance, with some private reservation of their own. Some people might have argued that it was better in the long run to save their lives that they might serve God in Babylon, even at the cost of a seeming surrender, than to let their influence be lost for a trifling scruple. There is a Mr. Facing-both-ways in the *Pilgrim's Progress*, and Mr. Facing-both-ways is a very familiar character.

Thank God if life forces upon us a choice between right and wrong or faith and no faith, which cannot be evaded. The worst thing that can happen to us is to find ourselves adrift upon an ocean so easy and calm it never brings us up against a situation where we have to grasp the helm and settle where we are going. The great thing is to face a dilemma squarely and seriously, seeing it with open eyes for what it is, without camouflage or evasion. If we see it and face it fairly, the choice is as good as made. For no one man can see evil with the naked soul and love it, and no man can see goodness with the open eye and shun it—if in the depth of his being he is ready to take God's way.

2. But now we come to the foundations of that faith on which they took their stand. First of all they took their stand trusting in what we call Providence. 'Our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace.' They believed that God would see them through and would not let them down. After all, they said to themselves, this world is in the control of God. However strongly the game may seem to run in favour of evil, there are other moves open to God by which the plans of evil may be checkmated.

Whatever we may think of this ancient view of Providence as the benevolent interference of God, it is well to keep an open mind. How the spiritual and the material are related we do not know. Wonderful forces can be set in motion, through prayer and faith, which defy explanation. In the long run the universe is on the side of the man who is on the side of God. Deep down at the base of things, love fashioned the earth in the interests of the Kingdom of God. Evil may play fast and loose with the world for a while, but only for a while. Sooner or later the men who use force to crush righteousness are met and destroyed by the very forces they have called into being. Or what is better still, as Christ has taught us, the very suffering they create sets free the love which will smite them to the heart with shafts of shame and compel them in sore contrition to lay their weapons at God's feet. The paradox of the Kingdom is that God does care for the material things of those who give up caring for them. That has often happened. Consequences are God's department. 'Our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thine hand, O king.'

3. But the faith of these men did not rest there, for that standing-ground is not deep enough to meet the facts of life in the tempting moment. We do not know what happened at this point. Perhaps they heard a titter, or saw a sneering look on the faces of those who were standing round; perhaps they heard a cynical whisper, 'We shall soon see.' And it flashed upon them—What if God did not deliver them! And just as suddenly the assurance of God's love and care shone up in their soul. Even if God did not deliver their body, His love was stronger than death or hell. 'But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.'

Deep down below all arguments the proof of religion is a vision of something which we see to be supremely good, of something for which, in fact, we discover we are willing to die. That was the position of these men. They were losing their faith or losing their lives, faced with the choice between faith and the furnace, and they suddenly

discovered that loyalty to God and purity and reverence were things for which they were willing to die, things which were far better than prosperity and riches, the favour of kings and even life itself. 'If not, if we have to die, be it known unto you, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.' What is that thing which they had seen? F. W. Robertson has a well-known passage in which he makes the same point, 'When everything is wrapped in hideous uncertainty I know of but one way in which a man may come forth from this agony scatheless. . . . If there be no God and no future life, even then it is better to be generous than selfish, better to be chaste than licentious, better to be brave than a coward.' But what is a man doing who is staking his faith on that inner value? He is staking his life on God, or to put it in terms of Jesus, he is taking his stand for the things for which Christ stood, the precious things which grow up and bloom in the shadow of His influence—for when we stand for Christ we are standing for these things, or we are not seeing Jesus at all. That allegiance of our souls in the moral crises of life to goodness, and purity, and love is the reality of our allegiance to Jesus.

What was God's response to the faith of Daniel's companions? The response was of two kinds. On the one hand it came in the kind of men it made of them and their larger influence for God in the community. It is true the writer of the story represents them as having been miraculously saved in the furnace. The Old Testament people were always looking for this kind of marvel. But God's miraculous entry into human life, as we know in Jesus, is through the miracle of a victorious man, whom faith in Him makes more than conqueror.

But there is another response—the consciousness of a Divine fellowship. There appeared in the furnace with them, 'One like unto the Son of man.' God's great answer to our faith is the assurance of what we call His presence. We may not realize it in feeling, but we know. The sense of Christ's presence does not always come to us in the same way. But in some way it comes, the deep, sure consciousness that He and we are one. And it comes when we go out to stand for Him and with Him, out beyond the little interests of our own life to where love meets the sin and suffering of the world in the shadows of Calvary. F. W. Robertson was once talking with a lady who was taking him to task for his views. She ended by saying she would have to inform the authorities. He replied, 'I don't care.' 'Do you know what happened to "Don't Care"?' she asked. 'Yes,' was the answer. 'He was crucified on Calvary.' There is a deep meaning in that. For all who go out to follow truth and right in their naked faith will come to a cross, but there they will find Christ and in that shadow know the brightness of His presence.[1]

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Beneficent Resistances.

'The things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the gospel.'—Ph 1^{12}.

In the passage before us, we have another illustration of the superiority of the spirit in man when he is on happy terms with his true source in God. It is a man in prison who writes these happy words, in which there is no anger, no bitterness, but the most beautiful reconciliation.

It is a thing which we cannot ponder too closely, that all the hopeful, happy, triumphant things that have ever been said about life have been said by suffering souls. It has never been from those who had to fight for their life or for their faith, that the hard things, the bitter things, have been said concerning life. All the moral light by which we live has been the legacy of hard pressed and contending souls. There have been no cynics amongst the poor. There has been no contempt for life amongst the poor. And these things bear witness to the true nature of our soul, and to the terms on which by God's appointment a man shall find and retain his highest life. A man is never so strong, so pure, so superior to circumstance, as when some shadow—be it cast by evil-fortune or bodily fear or by a thrust of moral uneasiness—closes him in with Jesus Christ, knowing that there in the presence of Christ or nowhere he must find his new motive for life. We know that it is just such things as Paul was enduring at this time—the loss of friends, the reproaches of enemies, the sense of failure and defeat, as men of the world might suppose—we know that it is such things as these that quicken and fortify all truly faithful souls.

We learn from evidence elsewhere that St. Paul

[1] J. Reid, *The Victory of God*, 283.

had a love for the Philippians above the love which he had for any of his other Churches: it was from the Philippian Church alone that he consented to receive money for his support. Now it is an evidence of true love that it wishes to spare the loved ones any wound; and so the Apostle is assuring himself and is trying to assure them that the things that have happened to him have not been bad things but good things, for they have done him good, and they have done good to others, and he is sure that the longer he lives, the more he will thank God for those very things which they and he might have deplored. 'The things which happened unto me,' he says, 'have fallen out rather unto the progress of the gospel,' and that in three ways:

1. In the first place, 'my bonds became manifest in Christ throughout the whole praetorian guard, and to all the rest' (v.[13]). St. Paul was sure that there in that rough camp, he was recommending the gospel which he preached. He was sure that here and there one among them would pause and wonder as to what might be the source of his peace. There were stoics at Rome in those days—men of a rigorous and austere morality, who knew how to stand unmoved in their days of disaster; but they never were joyful, they never were thankful for such days. They were only resigned. The best of them were sad. But what would arrest the minds of those soldiers, what St. Paul tells us did arrest them, was that he was lying in bonds, not for a crime, and not for sedition, but for the sake of some loyalty and honour towards God which they could admire, even though they could not comprehend it. A proof that Christ had come was—that St. Paul was there. And, therefore, he could say: 'My bonds are manifest in Christ.'

We cannot all perform, but we may all endure. Here is a service of Christ wherein all may enrol. We may endure hardness as His good soldiers. We may give God's providences their sweetest names. We may be patient when things are contrary, and modest when things are prospering with us. We may strive to preserve at all times the manner and bearing of those whom it cost much to redeem. We may not be able to do great things for Christ, and yet we may be great in the way we obey and endure.

2. In another way, as the Apostle sees, the things which had happened to him had fallen out unto the progress of the gospel. We have it in v.[14]: 'Most of the brethren in the Lord, being confident through my bonds, are more abundantly bold to speak the word of God without fear.' Faith is contagious. One helps another in the things of the Spirit. Courage begets courage. Many a battle has been won because at the critical moment a leader appeared or some one raised a cheer. It would appear that there were Christians in Rome who were losing heart, but the faithfulness of Paul was like the sound of a trumpet in their souls. We who stand committed to Christ are under a spiritual obligation to maintain a clear and decisive loyalty—not only for our own sake, but for the sake of those whom our steadfastness will strengthen, and whom our faultiness might confuse or discourage.

3. There was one thing more which led the Apostle to say that the things which had befallen him had fallen out unto the furtherance of the gospel. We have it in v.[19]: 'I know that this shall turn to my salvation, through your supplication and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ, according to my earnest expectation and hope.' In other words, for this is the heart of that saying, the great Apostle also confessed that harsh and baffling things may have their place in taking us further into the love of God.

It sometimes happens that we who know ourselves, and who do not wish to deceive ourselves, can say quite confidently why a certain thing had to befall us which did befall us. It was the last stroke of the eagle stirring her nest and driving out her young, not in a senseless cruelty, but only in order that her young may learn that they have wings. Just so things happen to ourselves which simply compel us to put our trust in God to a depth which otherwise we should never have attempted. Things on the other hand befall us at times about which, with all our desire to see the Hand of God, we cannot see the meaning or the value. But why concerning these things should we be in any ultimate doubt? We have still a long journey to go. We are poor judges of what we shall come to need. Why should we not believe that He, who knows what is before us, is putting us in readiness for it? Most of us can say in regard to the contrary and interrupting things that *have* befallen us, 'It was good for me that I was afflicted.' It is not a great venture of faith surely to believe that in regard to things in our experience, which may

be baffling and dark to-day, 'We shall yet praise Thee, O Lord.'[1]

TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

ARMISTICE SUNDAY.

No more War.

'And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.'—Is 2[4].

The bright expectation of this paragraph is found not only in the Book of Isaiah, but in Micah, and in the self-same words. It was, perhaps, common to prophetic minds in that age.

When the fulfilment was to be looked for is not quite clear: 'in the latter days,' say both Isaiah and Micah. Certain it is that the immediate future of Jerusalem offered the sharpest contrast to the prophet's picture. The city had become corrupt; long years of security and prosperity had bred luxury, social oppression, contempt of God. It did not surprise Isaiah that in his own time there was no apparent advance towards the ideal of his vision. Had he not known from the day of his call that his testimony would be unheeded? Whether men would bear or forbear, he must needs speak; nay, the tragedy of his lot was this, that he must speak, knowing that men would not hear. This picture of an era of peace and brotherhood stood in sharp contrast to the realities, and even to the tendencies, of his time, but he left it as a true God-given vision to find fulfilment in God's time and way.

The paragraph from which the text is taken is among the most familiar of Biblical passages to many of us. The singular beauty of the vision has appealed to us, and its hope has stirred us. It focused the expectation of our earlier years. Then came the Great War and the shattering of our anticipations. And now again there comes a stirring of hope, and it behoves us to consider whether these hopes are in vain and our aspirations noble but impracticable. And, therefore, we raise the question: Must wars continue to the end of time? There are three difficulties which hinder men from giving a hopeful reply.

1. There is an *erroneous use of the Scriptures*. The view is still held that it is almost impious to work for the establishment of lasting peace, because the outlook of the New Testament is upon an era of war without earthly limit. The authority of Jesus is pleaded on behalf of this gloomy expectation; special interpretations of the Apocalypse are adopted; various passages from the Epistles are cited. To meet the position fully would demand a series of sermons. We will only say in general terms that nothing can be more hopeless than the effort to get out of the language of Jewish Apocalypse, whether in the Gospels or elsewhere, definite pictures of human history and its lines of development. The people who undertake to deal with apocalyptic references, as containing a body of predictions awaiting fulfilment, land themselves in hopeless confusion. The value of apocalyptic sayings is not that we take them as literal descriptions, but that we get back to the thought that is at the heart of the Jewish eschatological notions, that only with God are all things possible, that not by human power alone can great deliverances be achieved, but always by the real presence and activity of the Supernatural—of God.

2. The second difficulty is found in *a pagan view of the State*. The traditional view of the State held by statesmen and diplomatists is appalling when viewed from the Christian standpoint. A State is regarded as possessing an absolute sovereignty; in effect it owes nothing either to God or man. Propositions which when laid down for an individual would be branded as unsound and morally detestable are laid down as a matter of course for the State.

If States were in their nature such as the political theory of to-day assumes, they would be inhuman monstrosities, and the duty of every lover of his kind would be to end their useless and dangerous existence. There is no place in an ordered society for an Ishmael; and no ordered and stable civilization is ever possible in a world consisting of States, each of which avows itself a corporate Ishmael.

Closely related to this view of the State as an absolute end is the common mode of speech held by statesmen. The State is a 'Power'—not a brotherhood, not an association for promoting the knowledge or happiness or well-being of its people or of the race, but something that possesses and exercises force. Put in what will seem a brutal form, but which is only too accurate, the respect which a State claims and receives is in proportion to its capacity to kill and destroy. Our thinking has got on false lines; we are the slaves of unexamined words—'State sovereignty,' 'Power,' and

[1] J. A. Hutton, *At Close Quarters*, 191.

so forth.' Bring those words to the test of reason and of Christianity, and they will be seen to stand for intolerable ideas; and when once the false doctrine is discerned in its pagan simplicity, we shall be on the track of true thought. At present we are the slaves of inherited superstitions.

3. We come to the third point—the enormous *practical difficulties in ridding the world of war.* There are, as we have seen, false notions to be replaced by true; there are deep suspicions having their roots in long-standing historical relations; there are sinister interests that thrive on human strife; in a word, there is the terrible fact of human sin. They who labour for world peace, and hope that it will some day be attained, are frequently told that they take too lightly the fact of sin.

But we must refuse to be frightened by talk concerning the vast power of sin. 'Why are ye so fearful, O ye of little faith?' Are we to conclude that in very truth goodness is feebler than wickedness, and that, because the hindrances to be overcome are enormous, we are justified in abandoning an ideal which commends itself most clearly when we are conscious of being nearest to our Master? Faith dares not reason so; it is still called on to remove mountains. It is true, as Lecky has said, that Christianity has been more successful in dealing with individuals than with communities, but though 'the mills of God grind slowly, they grind exceeding small.'[1]

What practical steps can we take? Let us turn to the League of Nations, for it implies a dethronement of the ideal of war. But the League of Nations requires the power of public opinion behind it. Now when the suffering of the Great War is still upon our hearts, now when the memory of the brave dead who gave their lives, not to win territory or fame, but to secure to future generations deliverance from the curse and horror of war, is still green in the loving and grateful appreciation of those for whom they died, we have the power that the League of Nations needs.

We thank Thee, Heavenly Father, for the great prophecies and dreams of the inspired men of Holy Scripture, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. May we believe in their visions as in Thine own decrees, and labour with all diligence to bring their realization nearer. Increase our faith, we beseech Thee, and take out of our hearts all malice and revenge, that we may believe in and work for the coming of the reign of the Prince of Peace. *Amen.*

[1] J. H. Rushbrooke, in *Christ: and the World at War*, 151.

Francis of Assisi.

By the Reverend J. P. Lilley, D.D., Edinburgh.

Whatever shortcomings may be found in the Italy of to-day, it cannot be said that the people forget to honour the memory of the great souls that have made her name famous amongst the nations of the world. This devotion was seen on a great scale in the month of September 1921, the sex-centenary of Dante's death. Then every municipality of the country, aided by the services of the Church and the publications of the press, joined in paying tribute to the poet of the *Divina Commedia.* In the latter half of the present year, a similar recognition is being made of the life and service of Francis of Assisi.

There is a link between these two names that is not always noted. It is clear that Francis' *Song of the Creatures* and other hymns encouraged Dante to choose the vernacular as the medium of his own work. It is plain also that the poet's sensitive heart was filled with admiration of the stand that Francis made against the worldliness and pagan corruption of the Church in the age in which he was born. To discern this, we have only to turn to the eleventh canto of the *Paradiso* and read the glowing eulogium of the saint which Dante puts into the mouth of Thomas of Aquino. There were two princes, says Aquinas, whom God in His mercy raised up to guide His cause amidst the troubles that beset it. One was the seraphic saint of Assisi; the other, Dominic, the cherubic light of Spain. Confining his own words to Francis, the speaker likens him to a sun, that, rising through a darkening sky, brought with his beams an orienta-

tion which was speedily felt in all the world. After a brilliant poetic outline of his career, Aquinas' only regret is that the Order of the Franciscans did not keep to its original pastures, but, straying over diverse meadows came back to the fold emptier of milk for the souls of men.

The chief sources of our knowledge of Francis are, first of all, his *Life* by Thomas of Celano, published three years after his death; then the *Mirror of Perfection* by his three chief companions; still later the *Life* by Bonaventura; and last of all the charming collection known as *The Little Flowers* of Saint Francis (the *Fioretti*). All of these writings have been utilized in many biographies of the saint during the last and the present century. They have also been subjected to keen criticism, notably by Nino Tamassia, the Professor of Law at the University of Padua; but in spite of such thorns the story of the saint's life and work still retains its roseate symmetry and beauty and fragrance, and yields both inspiration and guidance to all who study it in the right spirit.

In the limited space allotted to the present essay, I can attempt no more than a brief outline of Francis' early career and, after showing the later form it assumed, point out the spiritual forces by which it was moulded.

I.

Francis' parents were natives of Assisi, in the province of Umbria. His father, Pietro Bernadone, was a cloth merchant of good repute, who carried on a prosperous business in a shop of the town, but often left it in charge of others to go in search of attractive fabrics in other countries. He seems to have been specially fond of the goods manufactured in France, and was travelling there at the time when Francis was born in 1182. His mother, Pica, was in favour of calling him John; but when her husband returned home, he insisted that the child should bear the French name which in Italian was Francesco. The son grew up under his mother's tender care and exhibited a disposition full of bright humour and gaiety of heart. His mother was his teacher in music and the practice of song. From his earliest days, he was fond of his companions and drew out from them a deep and lasting affection. After the years of education under the priests of San Georgio were over, he entered into the business of his father and sold pieces of cloth in smaller or larger portions to the many customers that flocked in from the town and the country districts around. Apparently his father never stinted him in money to meet his personal needs, and set him free to join in all the amusements of the place. In the midst of this liberty, the lad fell into the company of youths of higher social standing than his own, but less strictly and devoutly nurtured than he had been. The result was that playing with them the part of a troubadour in the streets and even serenading far into the night, he spent both his money and his strength in a style of living that was sure to leave on heart and life the stains of self-indulgence and sin.

Even through this riotous career, however, while spending like a prince and reaping the harvest of folly, conscience was often sending its stings into his heart, reminding him that in spite of the fair show in the flesh with which he was fascinated, he had a nature that neither the world nor one of the things that were in it could ever satisfy.

It was to have this experience deepened in him that he was led to think of entering on a military career. The calling of a soldier lay close to the heart of every young man in the days when the inhabitants of one town had so often to fight for freedom and independence against the invasions of another. Francis was never slow in trying to respond to the summons for this warfare. But, as often as he did so, he was struck down with attacks of illness that prevented his carrying out the project to the desired end.

In the enforced retirement of these occasions, the gay young man had by the grace of God the opportunity of reviewing the course of his past life. Conscience renewed its accusations with such pungency that he began to feel the fair clothing he had been wearing and selling was of no more worth than rags, and that the money he had been receiving for it was the root of all the evil he had ever done.

Strangely enough, too, there sprang up in his heart a growing sympathy with the poor and the sick of the population in which he was so well known. Always himself unusually attractive to those that knew him, he felt awakened a still deeper and stronger interest in others. It was in full harmony with this new impulse that one day while he was serving a wealthy customer at his stall in the market-place, and a beggar approached him asking for alms, the moment the purchaser departed and the beggar himself was gone, he ran after the

poor man and heaped upon him every part of his own garments he could spare.

Visions or dreams also came to him in the silent hours of the night. He had been eager to build up for himself a great reputation as a military leader; but he seemed to hear a voice charging him to think of a grander edifice. The walls of the church of St. Damian lay in utter ruin: if he would prove true to God and himself and his fellow-men, let him arise and rebuild this waste house of worship.

It was in connexion with the project thus borne in upon him that the turning-point of his whole career at last emerged. Having received a large sum of money in the transactions of business, he suddenly gathered it all up and tendered it to the priest of the church for the expense of rebuilding. When his father discovered what had been done, he was so incensed at the young man that he struck and scourged him and had him shut up at home as in a prison: he even went on to have his son arrested and brought before the civil authorities as a thief and a robber. Francis stood the trial, but appealed for protection to the Bishop of Assisi. Advised by him to restore the money which still lay unused amidst the stones of the church, Francis allowed the claim of his father to it and laid the whole sum before his face. The very clothing also that he had received as part of his allowance for service, he stripped off and flung down in his presence. Then at last came the final and irrevocable decision of his life. Speaking to the crowd at the door of the Bishop's palace, he stood forth and cried: 'Listen all of you and understand. Until now I have called Pietro Bernadone my father; but since I have determined to be a servant of the Lord Jesus, I return him the money concerning which he was aggrieved and all the garments I have had from him, desiring henceforth to say, not Pietro Bernadone, but "our Father, which art in heaven."'

Many of us who read this poignant story hardly know whether the greater blame is to be attached to the father or the son. Both were far in the wrong, especially, I think, Pietro the father; for he showed the unrelenting bitterness of his spirit by cursing Francis in the street long after the rupture had taken place. The only palliation we can think of is that all this happened more than seven centuries ago, when parental authority was more absolute than it is now; and that then the members of a family were apt to cast off the bonds of allegiance and affection more abruptly than in our own days.

The only thing of which we have any certitude was that the outcast was then led by the hand of Christ as an orphan child of the world into the household of the Heavenly Father; and that, receiving there the best robe of a righteous inner life, with the ring of the Spirit of filial emancipation, and having his feet shod with the preparedness of the gospel of peace, he was thereafter constantly sustained by a rich and joyous banquet of all the grace and truth wrapt up in fellowship with the Father and His Son Jesus Christ.

II.

The subsequent events of Francis' career are so much a matter of ordinary historical narration that a short summary of them is all that is needed here. The walls of St. Damian were duly rebuilt as far as was possible at that time; but the self-imposed task at which he laboured, led him into such an utter dependence on the charity of the inhabitants of the town as to suggest an entirely new and lasting method of life. In short, Francis felt justified in trying to win his daily bread by asking for it at the hands of his neighbours. He does not seem to have thought that this step involved any loss of manly independence. By spending his strength in daily intercession for souls and in visiting and helping, if not healing, the lepers and the sick as no one else dared to do, was he not ministering to men in spiritual things? Why, then, should not they minister to him of the plain food they had in abundance for their own households? Such a return in carnal things was only a fair recompense in the sight of heaven. It humbled him before God and it blessed those that gave.

So deeply did this view of his place and calling in the world sink into his spirit that it formed in him a settled habit of obtaining support. He took up the lot of a mendicant; and adopting the garment of a peasant in the shape of a coarse greyish-brown cloak kept around his body by a thick rope girdle, he became a marked figure in the streets of Assisi and the surrounding country, and was everywhere recognized as one who was content with the poorest fare and yet was bent on doing good to all as he found opportunity. Meeting one of his early companions on the street one day, while walking in a quiet fashion, he was asked if he was in love and was going to be married that he was so medi-

tative. 'Yes!' was the instant reply: 'I am already wedded to Poverty.' This was only his vivid expression of a simple fact. As Dante put it, Poverty became the lady-love of Francis' heart, and his affection for her increased day by day.

But an invisible companion, however precious, cannot fully satisfy the human heart. It was not good for Francis to be alone; and in His kind providence God speedily raised up for him friends who should be with him and carry out his beneficent projects on a larger scale than he ever asked or imagined. First came to join him in his cell Bernard, the wealthy merchant who left all to share his toil; then the humbler but worthy Peter, followed by Egidio, Ginepro, and Masseo and others, till Francis found himself surrounded by no less than twelve comrades, all bent like himself on a life stamped with the spirit of Poverty and Chastity and Obedience. Preaching the gospel of repentance and faith was to be their main task; but with this was to be combined utter diligence in caring for all the poor degraded fragments of humanity for whom the religionists of the day had no thought.

In the experience of this toil Francis had visions of a vast access of followers ready to enlist under his standard and spread his work; and so vivid was the impression left on his mind that along with chosen companions he went on an embassy to the Pope in Rome to seek at his hands the formal recognition and institution of a new Order of lay brethren, who should be under the Papal sway and work for the glory of God and the revival of true religion in the Church. After many a cold reception and even hard rebuff at the court, Pope Innocent III. saw his way to accede to Francis' petition. Returning home in triumph, he found hundreds ready to join his cause. Thus was laid the foundation of the Friars Minor, or, as the title might be rendered, the Little Brothers.

How this Order was welcomed and increased not only through all the cities and towns of Italy, but in France, in Spain, in Germany, and the Netherlands, may be seen in any manual of Church History worthy of the name. No more fascinating record could be put into the hands of the readers and students of the Church. So enthusiastic was the reception accorded to the movement that a second Order, initiated by the daughter of a noble family of Assisi named Clare, had to be formed for the inclusion of women. To this was, in course of time, added a Third Order, which embraced multitudes that were not indeed expected or pledged to leave their homes or ordinary avocations, but were none the less bound to yield unfailing sympathy and co-operation in all the work the higher grades had at heart.

That Francis was able to guide this vast organization without sore travail of spirit cannot be imagined. It was too vast and varied to remain in every respect true to his ideal. He made many mistakes and suffered bitterly for them. One of the most grievous proved to be his reluctance to take for himself the place of the acting superintendent of the Orders. Instead of this, he favoured the appointment of one of his intimate friends, named Elias, who, able and devoted as he was, turned out to be too compliant with the less scrupulous leaders of the Church in erecting buildings, accumulating property, and even receiving money gifts from the rich, in ways out of harmony with the original aims of the saintly Founder of the Orders.

At last the time drew nigh when, worn out by fatigue and disappointment at home and missionary effort abroad in Syria and Egypt, Francis felt that his days on earth were speedily coming to an end. The mountain of Alverna was selected as the scene of a long retreat; and it was there that, according to his three chief companions, in the midst of intense concentration of thought on the Cross and actual vision of Him as the Lamb of God on the throne, he received from the Lord the Stigmata or reproduction of the five wounds in His own body made by the hands of those who hung Him on the accursed tree. This supernatural sign was the climax of his earthly experience before returning home to die. Dante, I think, evidently accepted the current belief concerning these tokens as based on well-attested evidence. For in the Canto already quoted from, Aquinas is represented as saying:

> On the rough rock 'twixt Tiber and the Arno,
> From Christ did he obtain the final seal
> Which during two long years his members bore.
> (*Paradiso*, xi. 106–108; tr. J. P. L.)

The first seal of his mission as a man of God was given by the Pope; the second and last came from the Lord on high. All that was left to him after prolonged suffering was to be carried home, to give his benediction to Assisi, and to affix his own seal by asking to be laid on the consecrated soil of the little hut of the Porziuncola and to die with his arms

outstretched in the form of the Cross. The sad event took place on October 3rd, 1226.

III.

But what now shall be said of the vital forces that animated the whole career of Francis? It is necessary to note these carefully, for here the soul of this great servant of the Lord issues its challenge to us all and summons us to follow him even as he followed the Master.

First of all comes into play the saint's study of the Bible. At the outset of his career he probably knew little more of it than what he had read in the Roman manuals of devotion. After the first three companions joined him, he began to feel the necessity of consulting the words of the Lord as recorded in the Gospels; and it is told how amazed he was when, opening the great Book that lay near the altar in the Church of St. Nicolo, he came in succession on the passages in which Jesus exhorts His followers to part with all they had and give to the poor; to take up their cross and follow Him; and finally to take nothing for the journey. From that day onwards Francis began to study the Bible as a whole. To him it was the supreme source of the Word of life. He pondered it and, like Jeremiah, ate it, till it became the joy and the rejoicing of his heart.

The effect of this sustenance is seen in the conception he formed of God and the relation in which he stood to Him. In spite of the intimate fellowship with God into which many of the earlier saints had entered, their ideas of Him as expressed in their doctrinal teaching are often very defective. They did not recognize and proclaim the truth of the Divine Fatherhood as they should have done. Even to Augustine, God was more the Sovereign Creator than the heavenly Father. But, as we have seen, this view did not satisfy the heart of Francis. Jesus had taken him by the hand and led him as an orphan into the household of God; and tasting there the fulness of the heavenly grace, Francis took at once the position of a little child in his chosen home and found the love of God pervading all His relations to mankind not only as Creator but as Parent and Possessor; as Redeemer and King; as Father and Friend. To him Jesus was the Word made flesh, the eternal Child; and in union with Him Francis was delighted to be absolutely dependent on God for continued life and growth and feeling, and no less also for thought and speech and service. What could the fruit of this experience be but a life of self-forgetfulness, spending its energy in buoyant activity on behalf of all around him, and receiving in turn a joy the world could neither give nor take away?

It was in this way that Francis was led to cherish and show such a deep sympathetic interest in his fellow-men. Even by nature, they were his fellow-offspring and the objects of God's parental affection. He felt that God was yearning towards every one of them, however sinful or degraded they might be, thirsting for their love, as men thirst for water in a parched and desert land. Why should he stand aloof from any of them? With the love of God brimming over his own soul, was it not for him to love every man with the love that was in the heart of God, the very love that God Himself was and is and shall be for evermore?

It is therefore no surprise to us to find that Francis looked upon the world of Nature around with a sense of kinship far above what was commonly felt in his day. The objects of the outer world were to his eye not merely the works of God's creative hand, but in themselves the expression of His eternal love and the channels by which it might reach and attract the heart and mind of man. Coming from the essential life and love of the Most High and intended to enrich and beautify the souls of His creatures, the orbs of heaven, the elemental forces of the world, and even the experiences of men in the midst of earthly existence, might be regarded as in a real sense the fellow-offspring of every true child of God.

It is this sense of the intimate union and communion with Nature into which the human soul may enter that constitutes the charm of Francis' *Canticle of the Sun*. In this respect, it rises higher than the Hebrew Psalm 148, on which it is based. Several literal prose translations of it have been made by eminent writers like Mrs. Oliphant, Matthew Arnold, and Father Cuthbert. The following rendering, while not forgetful of its primary simplicity, aims at bringing out by means of rhymed couplets the feeling of victory and jubilation that pervades the poem:

O dearest Lord, Almighty and Supreme,
Of glory, laud and honour be the theme.
With every richest blessing
Thee Maker aye confessing
Who among men is worthy even to name Thee?

By all Thy works adored,
Praised be Thy name, my Lord,
Chiefly for Master Brother Sun,
Who lights the moon by night when day is done.
Radiant and fair is he, Thy Name addressing,
With glowing power and glee Thy love expressing.

Praised be Thy Name for Sister Moon,
And for the Stars which ever hid at noon,
Are yet around us here by night;
And lit by Thee make the blue vault both clear and bright.

Praised be Thy Name, O Lord, for Brother Wind,
With Air and Cloud in calm and storm designed
To quicken life in souls where Thou art shrined.

For Sister Water, too, Thy Name be praised,
Precious and pure is she, and has been raised
To meet our many needs,
While to the Well of truth she humbly leads.

Praised be Thy Name, my Lord, for Brother Fire,
Who lights the darkening sky and can inspire
The fainting heart with strength and lift us higher.

Praised be Thy Name for Earth, our Sister-Mother dear,
Who takes and guides our life each growing year,
And yields the varied fruit our mouth and eyes to cheer.

Praised be the Lord for those who pardon give,
All for Thy Love, while weak and tried they live:
Happy the souls that thus in peace endure:
For them, Most High, Thy Crown awaiteth sure.

Praised be my Lord for our sweet Sister Death,
Whom none escape that live by air and breath.
Who die in mortal sin reap endless woe.
Blest those alone who ne'er Thy will forego:
On them, the second death shall strike no blow.

To my dear Lord praise, thanks, and blessing be,
O serve Him all with deep humility.

(Tr. J. P. L.)

It is not to be assumed, of course, that the *Canticle* was written in this complete form at first. It seems to have been often sung by Francis and his companions in the privacy of the cells, and thus perhaps gradually revised and expanded.

At this point it ought to be said that there was one class of animate objects in which, though not mentioned in the poem, the saintly singer was deeply interested, namely, the birds of the air. A story, partly legendary yet entirely characteristic, is told that, walking in the woods one day he heard a large flock of birds, singing and chattering in the trees. Approaching, he began to speak to them, while they kept silence and listened to his words: 'Ye are much cared for by God, ye birds, my sisters; and ye ought to praise Him ever and everywhere, because ye have freedom to fly everywhere: because ye have plumage painted and adorned; because ye have food prepared without your labour; because song has been taught you by your Creator. . . . Wherefore the Creator loveth you much. Therefore take heed, little birds, my sisters, lest ye be ungrateful, and study always to give praise unto God.'

Delighted, however, as Francis was with the freedom and joy of the realm of Nature, he found his deepest longings satisfied only in the practical work of the Church in his own city and country first, and then amongst the nations of the world.

Much has often been said of the wide sympathy he showed in the ordinary social life of men around him. He was keenly awake to the charms of music: for he who had sung as a troubadour in the streets of Assisi in the company of his young friends had a voice both rich and sweet; but now he used it in leading the praise of the crowds to which he preached. He had a great aptitude for dramatic art: for he influenced those he met by his manner and gestures as much as by his speech; but this gift too he learned to consecrate by arranging scenic reproductions of the Nativity for the delight and instruction of the people. He who thought so little of his own physical comfort was also ever diligent in caring for the sick and the suffering, even though many of them were lepers. It is indubitable also, I think, that what could be truly called miracles of healing were not seldom granted to him in answer to faith in Christ and prayer at His footstool.

But, after all, the greatest work he tried to do on behalf of the Church was the preaching of the gospel for the salvation of souls. Sometimes he would have been content to give himself to contemplation and study and intercession. But when, after renewed conference with his most trusted friends and companions, Clare and Sylvester, he became persuaded that the Lord called him to continue as a lay preacher of the Word of truth, he gave himself to this service with the utmost alacrity and zeal. 'Then,' he cried after the deliberation, 'let us go forth in the name of the Lord.'

In the varied records of his career, there is ample evidence that as an evangelist Francis wielded a deep and lasting influence. 'A man most eloquent,' one of his biographers testifies, 'cheerful in face, in

demeanour benign . . . tongue peaceful, ardent and eager . . . voice strong, sweet, and sonorous,' wherever he went, he found the people hanging upon his lips. Peer and peasant, rich and poor, flocked together and listened to him as a messenger sent by God: and the result was a revival of religion in Umbria such as had never been seen before.

But while thus proving himself a Christian patriot, Francis was also a lover of his fellow-men in every land under the sun. As we have seen, he discerned the unity of the missionary enterprise whether at home or abroad. They were but two aspects of the same work: as the one flourished, so would the other. Therefore like the Apostles of our Lord and the saints of earlier centuries before him, Francis became a precursor of all who have counted not their life dear unto them, if by any means they could fulfil the Master's commission to make disciples out of every nation on the face of the earth.

This is the crown of spiritual revival in every age. Many hearts in Britain, and not least in Scotland, are longing to see it laid on the head of the Church in these days. But if it is to be vouchsafed to us, it will only be, when the ministers of every Christian denomination, under the encouragement of the people as a whole, shall engage in the preaching of the gospel of the grace of God with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven and shall follow up their testimony by living a life marked by the self-sacrificing suffering love and childlike abandonment to the will of the Lord Jesus shown seven centuries ago in the career of Francis of Assisi.

In the light of these facts, we ought not to be surprised at the reverent enthusiasm with which the memory of this saint of the olden days is now being hailed in the land of his birth. If he was a mystic, he was at least a very practical one. If he was eccentric, he was still more Christocentric. If in the independence and freedom he claimed in his methods of dealing with men, he seemed sometimes to be almost beside himself, it was only because, like the Apostle Paul, he understood the people of his age better than we can do now. And if at other times, especially in the conciliar assemblies of the Church, he seemed too sober, it was simply because, again like Paul, the love of Christ for the souls of men constrained him and all who joined his side, to live not to themselves but to the glorified Lord, so that, living or dying, they should be the Lord's.

Contributions and Comments.

Gleanings from the Septuagint.

These four brief studies from the LXX are submitted in the hope that they may prove helpful in themselves, and induce others to make a more serious and connected use of the Greek Bible as a whole, not confining their attention only to the Greek of the New Testament. Nos. 1 and 2 are lexical, and their bearing on New Testament problems is obvious. Nos. 3 and 4 will help to prove the necessity for students of the Hebrew to keep a constant eye upon the LXX.

No. 1. Gn $37^{3.4}$, Ἰακὼβ δὲ ἠγάπα τὸν Ἰωσὴφ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ . . . αὐτὸν ἐφίλει ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἐκ πάντων τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ. This seems to establish a practical equality for ἀγαπᾶν and φιλεῖν as used in Hellenistic Greek. There is no more difference intended in these two sentences than there is in the two modes of expressing comparison by παρὰ and the accusative, and ἐκ and the genitive. It should be noted that the Hebrew uses but one verb אהב in both sentences. At any rate, New Testament commentaries on the noted passage Jn 21^{15-17} should not neglect this Old Testament parallel any more than they should neglect the Johannine passages 3^{35} and 5^{20}—ὁ πατὴρ ἀγαπᾷ τὸν υἱόν, and ὁ γὰρ πατὴρ φιλεῖ τὸν υἱὸν. From all of these it would seem undesirable to stress a difference of meaning in the change from ἀγαπᾶν to νφιλεῖ, and so Peter's grief was due rather to the reiteration than to the alteration of the question.

No. 2. μεταμέλεσθαι and μετανοεῖν. It is difficult to believe that those who have read the Psalms in Greek, or who have traced the LXX usage of these verbs by the help of Hatch and Redpath, would consent to the finding (as in Thayer) 'that μετανοέω is the fuller and nobler term.' In Ps 105 (106)[45] we read καὶ (ὁ Κύριος) μετεμελήθη κατὰ τὸ

πλῆθος τοῦ ἐλέους αὐτοῦ, and again in Ps 109 (110)[4] ὤμοσεν Κύριος καὶ οὐ μεταμεληθήσεται—a passage quoted by the author of Hebrews. Similarly in 1 K (S) 15[35] and in 1 Ch 21[15] this verb is predicated of the Lord. One may note also the use of the noun μεταμελεία in Hos 11[8], τί σε διαθῶμαι Ἐφράιμ; ὑπερασπιῶ σου Ἰσραήλ; τί σε διαθῶ; ὡς Αδαμὰ θήσομαί σε καὶ ὡς Σεβωείμ. μετεστράφη ἡ καρδία μου ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, συνεταράχθη ἡ μεταμελία μου. A most tender and poignant expression of Divine compassion.

No. 3. Am 6[1], Οὐαὶ τοῖς ἐξουθενοῦσιν Σειὼν καὶ τοῖς πεποιθόσιν ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος Σαμαρείας, 'Woe to those that make light of Zion, and put their trust in the mountain of Samaria.' If this were accepted as giving the real Hebrew it would nullify a very famous expression—'them that are at ease in Zion,' but it should act as a useful warning to those who would emend the Hebrew text not to do so without first consulting the Greek version. Had all critics consistently done this they would have transferred their attention in this passage to the Hebrew adjective rather than to the place name. Yet Cornill says of '"in Zion" very suspicious,' and Ehrlich emends so as to get 'woe to those that are at ease in their pride.' Some alteration does indeed seem needful, for Amos is 'dropping his prophecies' against Samaria and not against Jerusalem; nor is the Massoretic Text to be defended by a reference to 2[4. 5], for Judah is mentioned in the circling process among the peoples surrounding Samaria and not in the final swoop of his denunciation. The LXX rather insistently suggests that attention should be paid to the Hebrew adjective שַׁאֲנַן.

No. 4. In the ages of the patriarchs as given in Gn 5 it is well known that the Greek version increases by a hundred years the ages of five of them at the time when they begat their first son, but at the same time makes no difference in their final ages. This, of course, affects the question of Old Testament chronology, and it has been from that point of view that the alteration has been studied. I venture, however, to suggest that the alteration is of value from another view-point. The Greek translator shows, I think, a more scientific appreciation of the record from the angle of *vital statistics*. He sees that when the span of life (threescore years and ten) has its counterpart somewhere in the region of 900, then the age of puberty (which may be put in the vicinity of 15) should be represented by numbers ranging between 150 and 250, and not by numbers ranging between 50 and 100. In other words, he appears to me to have emended the Massoretic Text before him with a view to securing a closer agreement to the facts of life as known to him. Such scientific alertness is, I believe, traceable elsewhere in the LXX. One further query suggests itself when dealing with these inflated figures, and that is that they may in origin have been *lunar* and not *solar* periods, and a division by 13 would reduce the Greek figures to normality and even show that the race tendency was to too early puberty—leading to degeneracy—rather than to excessive longevity. This suggestion is not, of course, attributable to a study of the LXX text, but may be regarded as a corollary of the first consideration which is due to the LXX.

H. Highfield.

Aberystwyth.

Entre Nous.

The Terms in which we think of Christ.

Here, probably, the best known of The Mendenhall Lectures of DePauw University was that delivered in 1919 by Dr. Kelman on 'Some Aspects of International Christianity.' The selection of lecturers under this foundation is not limited to any denomination, the object of the lectureship being to bring to the University 'persons of high and wide repute, of broad and varied scholarship, who firmly adhere to the evangelical system of Christian faith.' In 1925 the lecturer was Dr. Lucius Hatfield Bugbee, and the title of his lecture *Christ To-day*. This short study in the contemporary meaning of Christian thought and experience has now been published by The Abingdon Press (75 cents). Within the space at his disposal Dr. Bugbee gives an interesting résumé of the trend of much of the present-day thought about Christ. To a large extent, he says,

the terms in which men thought of Christ in other ages have become inadequate for us—just as our terms will not satisfy those who come after us, for we cannot exhaust the meaning of Jesus. We are too far removed from the symbolism of temple and altar and bleeding sacrifice to find the figure of 'the Lamb of God' or 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world' satisfying. Nor are we sufficiently familiar with ancient philosophy and literature to get the full meaning out of the 'Logos.'

In what terms, then, do we think about Jesus to-day? It is quite evident that as never before we are thinking of Him as the Saviour of the world. 'To the Christian thought of the present moment, Jesus is the one solution of all our world difficulties. If society is to be saved from disintegration, His spirit and principles must finally triumph over the antagonisms, divisions, and prejudices of races and nations. He must finally bring together in one all things in Himself, as Paul suggests.' In a later chapter on 'Sin and Saviour,' Dr. Bugbee says, 'It must be quite clear to all that if we have not lost the sense of sin we have certainly changed our mode of thinking about it. It does not mean to us what it meant to our forefathers. . . . There is a quaint story of Jesuit missionaries who were working among the Indians in Canada in the early days of American history. They sent home to France for pictures and cartoons that might be used in presenting their messages, and they suggested that "of souls in bliss one will be enough, but of souls in perdition many are to be sent, for they will be useful." If we were giving such directions to-day, we would reverse the order: of souls in perdition one would be enough, but of souls in bliss many would be welcome. Such is the changed emphasis of our teaching.

'I am not passing judgment now upon this change of emphasis, I am simply stating the fact,' he adds.

Again, we are thinking of Jesus to-day, Dr. Bugbee says, not only as the Saviour of the world, but as the compassionate Lover of all men everywhere. His enthusiasm for humanity is uppermost in our thought. 'We are seeking to interpret his life in terms of institutions of mercy and help and in all sorts of effort for human betterment.'

And, again, we are thinking of Christ as the authoritative Teacher 'whose divine word is to be obeyed not only by the individual in his personal relationships but by society in its commercial and industrial relations, and by governments in their dealings with one another. We believe that he claims the right to rule over every aspect of life. If the social interpretation of his message is prominent in our thought to-day, it is not because we have forgotten the personal meaning of that message. It is simply because the new social consciousness of men is seeking to interpret Christ in this larger and wider way.'

Respect for Personality.

After editing *The Christian World Pulpit* for thirty-eight years, Mr. H. Jeffs has just retired. The present volume—volume cix.—is the last one to be issued under his editorship (James Clarke; 7s. 6d. net). It is as good as ever and shows the usual variety. We have noted sermons by Dean Inge, Bishop Hensley Henson, Dr. Gore, Dr. Orchard, Dr. J. D. Jones, and Dr. F. T. Woods. In this volume there are published also a portion of the Essex Hall Lecture delivered on May 27th by Professor J. Arthur Thomson, and a paper by Mr. R. H. Tawney, Lecturer at the London School of Economics. The title of Professor Thomson's lecture is 'Man in the Light of Evolution.' This lecture has been published this month in its complete form by the Lindsey Press, and we have drawn attention to it in the 'Notes of Recent Exposition.'

We find the same idea, though approached from different standpoints, in these two lectures. It is the modern idea of respect for personality. Darwinism, says Professor Thomson, should encourage rather than discourage us when we think of the long succession of achievements in organic evolution. 'There is nothing in biology nor in evolution to warrant us in thinking less nobly of man; but the tendency to over-simplify is very strong. It is so easy to lose the soul in the mind, and the mind in the body, and man in the mammal, and life in the dust.

'There is another way of combating and correcting the feeling that Darwinism has belittled man. We must think not only of what man has been, but of what he is and might be. We should judge everything by its best expression. And then, what a piece of work is man! He harnesses the forces of nature, and makes them drive his many chariots. He controls life, and staves off death. He creates the incomparably beautiful in his art, and makes the world translucent by his science. He sends his ethical tendrils to the stars. But it is especially

in the light of evolution that we feel sure of man's promise of future achievements worthy of the past. Far from depreciating man, evolution aggrandises him.'

Now let us see how this idea of respect for personality underlies Mr. Tawney's lecture on 'Christ and the Industrial Order.' 'It seems to me,' he says, 'that Christians are entitled to express a definite preference for certain kinds of economic arrangements and industrial organization as compared with others, if they find that the former rather than the latter promote spiritual development. I presume that the primary criterion by which we ought to judge our social organization is not whether it contributes to material success or prosperity, but in what degree it promotes spiritual growth. Too often that criterion is applied last, or not at all, and Christians who do not insist that it ought to be applied first are not merely neglecting a work of supererogation, they are, as it seems to me, betraying the very citadel of their faith.'

In passing let us say that this question as to whether religion is concerned only with the souls of individuals or with the whole scheme of society is one which we are not allowed to lose sight of to-day. Dr. Bugbee, in the lecture which we have already noticed, tells the story of a delegate to a great church conference who was reported to have said 'that the membership which he represented did not wish the church to concern itself with business, politics, or international relations. Its conviction was that it should confine itself entirely to preaching the Lord's kingdom.'

But to return to Mr. Tawney. He does not give his own opinions as to what form of reorganization must take place so that the mass of men may feel that the principles on which society is based are just. He does, however, make three simple suggestions: That we should, first, determine to know something about the lives of our fellow human beings. In the second place, that we should set ourselves against the vices of class pride. 'At the present time one of the issues with which the public conscience is faced is a very simple one. It is: Would they rather spend a little more money on children at the cost of some inconvenience and perhaps even sacrifice to themselves, or would they rather spend a little more money on themselves, at the cost of some stunting of the growth—physical, intellectual, and often moral—of several million children. That is the issue which proposals for reduction of expenditure on education involve.' In the third place, Mr. Tawney says we can use our influence to 'support those movements, of very different kinds and often with contradictory watchwords, which aim at greater equality and at spreading more widely the conditions of a good life for all.'

Possessing their Possessions.

A new volume by Mr. F. W. Boreham, with the title *A Tuft of Comet's Hair*, has just been published by the Epworth Press (5s. net). 'This new volume,' the publishers say, 'is as varied and as full of insight as any of the fourteen which have preceded it.' And this is not mere propaganda on the part of the publishers. For Mr. Boreham appears to have the gift of writing about all the ordinary things of life in volume after volume without exhausting himself. One of the chapters in his new volume is woven round the words of Obadiah 17, 'The house of Jacob shall possess their possessions.' It is on the Law of the Second Crop. Mr. Boreham made this his text one Sunday, and it had an immediate result. '"Laugh!" exclaimed Dan Kirkland, as he embarked upon the story of his memorable discovery. "I never laughed like it in my life! And on a Sunday, too! You used an illustration about books. You said that a man who had got together fifty books, and read them, would get more satisfaction out of his modest shelf-ful than the man who owned a splendid library and never dipped into the volumes he had bought. The only secret of real happiness, you said, lies in *possessing your possessions*. My word, that sermon set me thinking. I went away laughing at myself. I was fair ashamed to be seen going home from church in such a frivolous state of mind. Yet, the more I thought about what you had been saying that morning, the more inclined I felt to burst out laughing."' And up to the moment of hearing that sermon Dan Kirkland had been very far from laughing. 'Molly and I,' he explains, 'had about a hundred and fifty pounds in the Savings Bank: we bought up mining shares and lost every penny. At just about the same time, the barn was burned down, and, a week or two later, two of our best cows died. We were hard hit and we felt it terribly; Molly wasn't able to get to church, or to go anywhere else, just then;

and she used to sit at home here and mope. And I wasn't much better; I fretted about things from morning till night, and, sometimes, from night until morning. That sermon set me thinking. "Here," I thought, "I've been spending all my time fretting about the money that's lost, and the barn that's burned down, and the cows that are dead: and I've clean lost sight of the only things worth thinking about—the things that are still mine!" I thought of Molly—the best little wife in the world: I thought of the baby that was so soon to be born: I thought of the home and the farm and the cattle: I thought of the health and strength that I enjoyed—I've never had a day's sickness in my life—and I burst out laughing. I believe I laughed all the way home from church. And when I got home, I made Molly laugh too. We've often smiled about it since.'

'I have learned in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content.'

Seventeen addresses which Dr. Stuart Holden gave at Keswick, including the one given in his capacity as Chairman of the Convention Council at the Jubilee gathering in 1925, have been collected and published by Messrs. Marshall Brothers. The title which Dr. Holden gives the volume is *The God-Lit Road* (6s.). One of the addresses, marked by the sincerity and the conviction which are the keynotes of his preaching, is on the text, 'I have learned in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content' (Ph 4^{11}). One of Dr. Holden's thoughts about St. Paul, and about Christian biographies generally, is that they are like smoked glasses through which we look at the nature of God. 'On bright days it is impossible for any of us to look up at yonder mountains, when the sun is shining in full strength, without shading our eyes or using smoked glasses. It seems to me that the Christian biographies available to us in the word of God are like smoked glasses through which we look, unblinking, at the nature of God, which is our final confidence, and through which also we see the infinite possibilities of our own redeemed lives.'

In closing this address Dr. Holden says that the man who is upheld by the consciousness that Christ dwells in him is sustained by the glorious hope, as St. Paul was, that his Lord is coming again. 'Some time ago, when in America, I heard some lines which were written as the result of a visit paid by Mr. Shadwell, one of America's poets, to a camp meeting among the negro cotton workers in the Bahamas. He heard some of those black-skinned, white-souled believers singing about the coming of the Lord. And he put into a more literary form the burden of this song. It was this:

There's a King and Captain high,
Who is coming by-and-by,
And He'll find me hoeing cotton when He comes!
You can hear His legions charging,
In the regions of the sky,
And He'll find me hoeing cotton when He comes!
When He comes! when He comes!
All the dead shall rise in answer to His drums;
And the fires of His encampment star the firmament on high.
And the heavens shall roll asunder when He comes!

There's a Man they thrust aside,
Who was tortured till He died,
And He'll find me hoeing cotton when He comes!
He was hated and rejected,
He was scorned and crucified,
And He'll find me hoeing cotton when He comes!
When He comes! when He comes!
He'll be crowned by saints and angels when He comes;
They'll be shouting out 'Hosannah!' to the Man that men denied,
And I'll kneel among my cotton when He comes!

The publishing office of the Wesleyan Methodist Church has in preparation a collection of the Letters of John Wesley, which it is desired to make as complete as possible. The Editor of the Letters will be grateful if any who may possess original letters of John Wesley would favour him with a copy of such, addressed to The Rev. John Telford, B.A., 3 Rothes Road, Dorking, Surrey.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Whatever Dr. W. R. Matthews writes is worth reading. It is certain to be fresh, suggestive, and penetrating. He is one of the men in the theological world whose voice counts in any debate. It is therefore with interest and expectation we turn to his article in the *Church Quarterly Review* on 'Some Recent Tendencies in Philosophy and the Doctrine of the Incarnation.' There is no doubt that the Incarnation is the central truth of the Christian religion, and there is as little doubt that it is the centre of the controversial battle to-day. In what sense, and on what grounds, can we call Jesus Divine? That is the real question to-day, and every one who seeks to adjust his faith to the changing conditions of the intellectual environment has to ask and answer it.

What has philosophy to say that bears on the subject? We may reasonably seek from it an account of the world-view characteristic of our time. And if we are to adjust our faith to the prevailing intellectual outlook we ought to get some help from philosophy. But here there is a difficulty. The world-view is not a stable thing. It is constantly changing, and when we turn to seek help from philosophy, Dr. Matthews seems inclined to echo Dr. Gore in asking whether there is any coherent philosophy in existence. There are all sorts of schools of philosophy, each saying a different thing. Yet it is to philosophy we must turn if we are to get any conception of the idea of the universe which is emerging in the mind of to-day.

And when we look closer we discover that all the schools of philosophy arrange themselves in two groups—one that begins with the object, Nature, the given, and strives to build up a system on that basis; the other that begins with the subject, the knower, and attempts to construct a view of the universe as essentially thought, spirit, mind. The difficulty that one feels is how mind can find a place in Nature; the difficulty of the other is to find 'Nature's place in mind.' These are roughly realism and idealism. And representatives of these two schools at present who may be taken as typical are Professor Alexander and Professor Lloyd Morgan of the one, and Giovanni Gentile of the other.

The most interesting development in English thought on the naturalistic side is the theory of emergent evolution. This is not creative evolution, for the adherents of the former are opposed to the idea of a force which falls outside the order of Nature, whether you call that force God or *élan vital*. And yet it is not the old naturalism. It rejects the old mechanistic view. Its real point is the emergence of something essentially new, and that is naturalism with a difference. It is a kind of half-way house between mechanism and teleology. For though there is no plan beforehand, things work

out 'so as to produce a plan.' There is a *nisus* towards higher values. In short, there is everything of a purpose except the Purposer.

How does the doctrine of Incarnation stand in this environment? Dr. MATTHEWS thinks that the spiritual values for which the Incarnation stands could be conserved under this scheme. It would be possible to hold that Jesus represents the emergent quality towards which the *nisus* is tending. But the real meaning of the Incarnation, the finality of Jesus and the embodiment in Him of a Purpose, could not be maintained. That is true of Professor Alexander's scheme. It is a good deal different when we turn to Professor Lloyd Morgan. For his position goes beyond mere naturalism. It is rather a monism which regards the temporal process as a manifestation of timeless spiritual substance. In this sense the emergent evolution may be regarded as the unfolding of a Divine purpose. And we have thus a place for the Incarnation. Yet even in this more spiritual view there are aspects of the Incarnation which it seems difficult to preserve. There is no breaking in of another order on this, nor is there any possibility of holding to the two natures in Christ. For to emergent evolution, as to all naturalism and monism, there is only one order and there is no room for any dualism.

When we turn to the other line of thought, the idealistic, we take Gentile as a representative because his position is the purest kind of idealism. To him all is thought. Spiritual reality is the pure act of thought. When I speak of 'I,' for example, it is not what I mean in ordinary speech. My real ego is the transcendental ego, the thought which is continually realizing itself in the manifold of Nature and of empirical selves. Gentile would seem to find reality in nothing static, but in movement, the act of thinking. Is it possible to find a place for Incarnation in such a purely idealistic scheme? For a Christology certainly. There is room for a Christ who is the Divine Thought in us and in the world, a sort of sublimated Christ. But not for Incarnation of the Chalcedon formula.

What, then, is the result of a survey of contemporary philosophical tendencies? We may note some positive gains. *Both* the schools referred to agree in one thing, and that of great importance. They both come in the end to conceive the world as spirit, and as a realm in which spiritual values are realized through human personality. That is a gain. But there is something just as important to be said that raises a difficulty. Both schools agree in repudiating dualism; the familiar antithesis, Nature and the supernatural, God and man, disappears. And it is therefore clear that to the modern mind dogmas which are expressed in terms of such a dualism will be difficult.

Dr. MATTHEWS has one final suggestion to make. He protests that what we want to keep is not any one formulation of the doctrine of Incarnation, but the spiritual values for which it stands. If the formulation of these is outworn, ought we not to seek other terms in which to express the spiritual values? Dr. MATTHEWS suggests that we shall find such a new and better formulation in the Logos conception. It is inclusive of both immanence and transcendence, and both these conceptions are involved in the two schools of thought reviewed. At least neither is excluded. In any case we must restate our faith not in terms which represent a world-view now outworn, but in terms of the thought of our day, of that belief in an Immanent Spirit which is behind all the life and movement and thought and achievement of man.

It is long since Principal A. E. GARVIE earned his right to an attentive hearing from the Christian public when he chose to address it on theological matters, whether in their intellectual or their practical bearing. Besides being one of our most distinguished theologians, he is also one of our best known preachers, and he has ably represented his Church at conferences where momentous issues were at stake. We turn therefore with high expectation to his recent book on *The Preachers of the Church* (James Clarke; 6s. net).

Twice before Dr. GARVIE has written on preaching—in his 'Guide to Preachers' and in 'The Christian Preacher'; but the distinctive aim of 'The Living Church' series, to which this book is a contribution, has enabled him to traverse the familiar ground in a new way, and to present the subject under fresh aspects. The interest of the volume is further enhanced by a few autobiographical touches.

In dealing with the relation of the preacher to the Bible, for example, he hints that some of his brethren may regard him as 'too outspoken on all such matters,' and he tells us that he has even had the epithet 'blasphemer' applied to him. It adds to the force of his argument on the relation of the preacher to the social problem when he assures us that he has had practical experience of business, and when from this vantage-point he can affirm that 'with all deference to the laymen who are in business, the properly trained preacher is likely to have a wider knowledge and a keener insight in regard to Christian morality even in its particular applications, except as regards expert knowledge of the details of any business.' And his friendly reference to the Copec and the Stockholm Conferences shows how heavily the grave problems of the modern world lie upon his heart.

His book is divided into two sections: the first historical, the second practical. This is a happy division; for it enables him, before proceeding to practical counsels for the preacher, to give a vivid presentation of some of the great preachers of the Church at different periods of her development, such as Chrysostom, Bernard of Clairvaux, Calvin, Schleiermacher, etc., and to show how wisely in those various periods—prophetic, apostolic, patristic, scholastic, reformation, revival, and missionary—they adapted their message to the intellectual, social, and spiritual needs of their time.

Valuable as this historical sketch is, it is probably to the practical section that preachers will most eagerly turn. For, while preaching that is worth while has never been easy, it is to-day beset by peculiar difficulties: for, as Dr. GARVIE puts it, 'one of the tragedies of the present hour is the extent to which the pulpit has lost command over the cultured class as well as the labouring masses.' Of the former, some of those who still care for the things of the spirit have run to Christian Science, Theosophy, and the Ethical Society; while of the latter many suppose, foolishly enough, that the Church has little interest in their needs and aspirations.

The problems presented to the preacher by Biblical criticism, modern science and philosophy, and modern social and industrial life are faced by Dr. GARVIE with engaging candour, and we feel in every phase of the discussion that we are in the hands of a wise and trusty guide, who knows not only the Christian way but the ways of the modern mind. The remedy for the present distress is just the old remedy, the gospel—nothing less and nothing more.

But Dr. GARVIE has some rather scathing things to say to those who misunderstand the meaning and implications of that deceptively simple phrase, 'the simple gospel.' 'The man,' he tells us, 'who claims to put the Gospel in a nutshell offers a measure, not of the Gospel, but of his own mind. The clamour for a *simple* Gospel is a stupid and lazy demand.' The presentation of the gospel should be as simple and lucid as the preacher can make it; but the gospel itself has to do with the deep things of God. It has endless implications and ramifications, it affects the whole range of individual and social experience, it penetrates the world of economics and politics and thought no less than the world of spirit; so it may happen that 'the demand for the simple Gospel is, even if unconsciously, a desire to enjoy the benefits without accepting the obligations of Christ.'

Governing all that Principal GARVIE has to say with regard to the preacher's treatment of the modern situation, whether in the world of industry or of thought, is the principle that he must qualify

himself, by a study as thorough as possible, to understand that situation. Without an experience of God, he has no competence to speak of God; so without some hard-won knowledge of the problems of the time, his treatment of these problems can be little more than an impertinence. It is not his business to produce solutions—even the expert may hesitate before such a demand; but it is his business to acquaint himself, so far as for him is possible, with the real nature of the problems which harass the minds of those whom he addresses.

Dr. Garvie illustrates this thesis in several directions. An unapplied principle may be little better than a platitude. Not afraid of coming down to detail, Dr. Garvie shows how some aspects of the social problem may be dealt with in the pulpit, and he maintains that no preacher is really meeting the challenge of the times 'unless he summons industry to appear before the judgment-bar of Christ.'

His remarks on 'the new psychology' are equally to the point. A knowledge of psychology, if it be adequate and not superficial, is part of the necessary equipment of the preacher. The phases of recent psychology which glorify instinct to the depreciation of reason and conscience exercise a fascination as fatal as it is intelligible over certain minds; and it is the preacher's duty to understand and to combat such interpretations of human life as tend to obliterate the distinction between the man and the brute.

So the Principal goes through the dominant phases of modern thought and shows the preacher how he should relate himself to them, and how he may most helpfully guide those who are perplexed by them. One of his most useful discussions is that in which he deals with the proper attitude of the pulpit to the questions raised by Biblical criticism.

Here, as everywhere, the broad principle is that the truth must be spoken in love. No true Christian preacher will ever give needless offence. But this does not mean that ignorant and blatant opposition to the methods and conclusions of reverent Christian scholarship is to remain unrebuked and unrefuted. Some of Dr. Garvie's most vigorous thrusts are dealt at 'the zealous but unwise defenders of the older views about the Bible who by their distortions of what the modern scholarship teaches are doing untold mischief to the cause which they undoubtedly have at heart.'

The Bible is indeed infallible—Dr. Garvie admits that—but 'infallible in its proper purpose, to bring God to men, and men to God.' But those who substitute for this, its proper infallibility, an infallibility which the Bible nowhere claims 'are often so offensive and intolerant that they do not deserve consideration, and even invite a chastisement by speech.' 'It is the traditionalists who are a far greater peril to the preservation of the Gospel for the thought and the life of to-day than are even the negative critics.' These are strong words, but they are not too strong; and Dr. Garvie, by his own solid contribution to theological learning, has earned the right to say them.

The preacher who believes in the modern approach to the Bible will not, as a rule, obtrude it: rather it will be implicit in all his presentations of religious truth, so that his hearers will, by a gradual and practically unconscious process, be detaching themselves from obscurantist views. But there are times, Dr. Garvie believes, when the preacher, if he is competent, is bound to deal with these subjects explicitly; and, speaking generally, the Bible class or the week-evening meeting will furnish the most suitable opportunity for such an effort.

In a concluding chapter Dr. Garvie touches on the momentous question of theological training. What curriculum will best equip the student for the ministry of preaching? Many will agree with him that on some students the linguistic demands are too burdensome, but those who believe in an educated ministry will equally agree that if these demands are replaced by others, then no less a

breadth and accuracy of knowledge should be exacted in these substituted subjects than in those involving linguistic discipline. Whatever is done should be thoroughly done, whether it be the exploration of the twentieth century or of the first.

The writer of this book is equally at home in the modern world and in the gospel: above all he is one who, in a world which is tending to depreciate preaching and to replace its appeal by ritual or literature, magnifies the office of the preacher. And there can be few preachers so competent for their task that their ministry would not be enriched, guided, and stimulated by this able book.

The modern world has travelled far away from the time when theology was reverenced as the queen of the sciences. To many minds nothing seems more sterile than theological discussion, and even preachers and students of theology are in haste to leave it in their eagerness to come at something more practical. Signs, however, are not wanting that this cloud is passing, and that theology will presently resume its sway as the science of the ultimate and most vital reality. Indications of this appear in a series of thoughtful addresses delivered to students at Swanwick, and now published under the title of *Theology and Life* (S.C.M.; 4s. net). Specially worthy of note is a paper by Dr. KULLMANN on 'Doctrine and Life.'

Preachers and theologians, he believes, are still wanted. Why? Because 'this whole busy humanity of ours, so exclusively *this*-worldly, knows, in spite of everything, that somewhere, somehow, all this life of ours must be hooked up on a nail. . . . It is not we who are asking a question. God is asking us, He who is craving for our answer, who cares for *one* answer only—our love.' And because there is no escaping this question, men cannot help looking around for an answer. 'I tell you why the world needs theologians and preachers. They want you to tell them the answer to God they do not know themselves. . . . People need you because they cannot escape from God questioning them. And they want you to tell them the word, in order to answer; the word about death which is a new life, the word about death which is resurrection, the word about sin and evil which is forgiveness and salvation, the word about the dreadful unknown which is revelation. Not *words*, not *your words*, they do not care about your words: God's WORD through your words.'

Yet theology is sick and discredited, a deposed queen, tolerated perhaps beside other sciences, but looked upon as abstract, a mere side-show of vital religion. There are reasons for this. For one thing 'Theology has lost, to a large extent, a vital connection with the order of revelation and grace.' The order of grace means that in our act of faith we are touched and overwhelmed by God's reality breaking graciously in upon us. Ours is merely the desperate yearning for Him; His the merciful gift of grace. There is no knowledge of God outside grace and revelation. We can know about God only through His speaking to us about Himself. 'And yet theology plays with names and rational concepts *about* God. Whether dogmatic or anti-dogmatic, she has not any more the power to grasp the fact that behind and within human words and concepts we perceive God's living Truth.' God becomes merely an object of our investigation, like any other phenomenon of our consciousness. It follows from this that doctrinal statements about God become assimilated to scientific knowledge and are put in the same category with scientific findings about other subjects. Once the dogmas have been emptied of their mystical treasures, once theology has broken loose from the order of revelation and grace, the human reason, autonomous, knowing no other criterion than that of formal logic, begins to investigate the facts of revelation and faith with the whole apparatus of modern science. 'This passionate attempt to dissolve the order of grace and revelation in human reasoning, with science as the central object, included in its scope the personality of Jesus Christ. All the many lives of Jesus in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as they are

analysed in masterly fashion in Schweitzer's book, give you a stirring picture of what we have done with the God-Man, our Lord Jesus Christ, of how we can get to know Him outside the order of revelation and grace! A wandering Jewish preacher with a hypertrophied self-consciousness! Is this the living foundation of power, the fearful and adorable image of God's love? Are we going to feed the hungry and the thirsty with exegetical shrewdness, popular scientific theories, to explain the miracles, the Resurrection?'

Something else happened. 'Necessarily a reversion of order in the thought-plane was very soon accompanied by a reversion in the religious plane proper.' The phenomenon of religion is a human affair, just as the phenomenon of art or law. We got hold of this religious instinct and began to feel it was the primary thing. Religiously it meant that we began to adore our religiosity, instead of a loving God. Transcendence broke off from immanence, and immanence was made an idol. Thus, 'as we view the whole field of modern theology, we see that the sickness is not due to a conflict between traditional and rational supernaturalism and humanised liberalism—orthodoxy *versus* modernism. Neither of these aspects is sound, neither has the right to challenge the other. They are both wrong, their very existence is the symptom of crisis. *The one and the other are to-day the biggest stumbling-block in the presentation of the Christian faith.* Who wonders then that theology is discredited, and Christian life turns its head from Christian thought and doctrine?'

What is the remedy? Life is revolting against doctrine, but life is helpless without doctrine. Doctrine has to go back to life and be healed in healing life. Doctrine and life cannot live without one another. In the depth of our heart we know it. Among the many healing processes which have to take place in the Christian Church this is one of the most urgent. 'What we need is not merely *re-statement* but a new vision for the whole field of doctrine and dogmatics. We must learn to be more objective and not to over-emphasise our emotional inner life, with its religiosity and its emotional moods; on the other hand, we must be more critical about our passion for doing. He who loveth Him, knoweth Him. Do we know Him? Is the mind not God's gift? Must the mind not be redeemed as well as our hearts and our wills?'

At the same time we must keep in view the danger of Gnosticism. No doctrinal cognition whatever will replace the immediate experience of God we have in prayer and sacraments. There is no salvation and power in the mere road of contemplation. 'It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.' We have to approach Him in fear and trembling, and in love and faith. 'The central dogmatic formulations of Paul and of the Early Church, especially the Christology, are statements made in fear and trembling and in love and faith, when "we have come to know God, or rather to be known of Him," in other words, when God speaks in man, in His Church, through the Holy Spirit. And it is wisdom not of this world. Only rationalisation makes dogma wisdom of this world. It is foolishness to us because it is wisdom to God. And dogmas are descriptive on our plane of what happens on the eternal plane. Yet more, as God reveals Himself through them, dogmas partake of the wonder of incarnation; human words and concepts of this world become bearers of Truth Eternal. Dogmas are at the cutting line of the two planes. And instead of rationalising them and then throwing them away, we had better take off our hats, as Luther once said, and by prayer and repentance endeavour to get such a hold of God that He may open our eyes and let us see, through the dogmas, the Truth.'

Judaism and Universalism in the Gospels.

By Professor C. J. Cadoux, M.A., D.D., Shipley, Yorks.

I.

The problem with which these two articles attempt to deal is this: how far did Jesus Himself foresee, and explicitly foretell and enjoin, that universalism which, within thirty years of His death, had become so marked a feature of the movement which He started; and how far, on the other hand, was He, as a Jewish teacher among Jews, influenced by that strong nationalistic particularism which we commonly associate with the Judaism of His time?

I. Jewish Universalism.

We may remind ourselves, in the first place, that even in the Old Testament there is a good deal of quite explicit universalism. Israel started indeed with belief in a tribal deity, Yahweh, beside whom there existed many other deities worshipped by other tribes and nations. But with the growth of Hebrew national greatness and religious insight, Yahweh came to be regarded, first as stronger than and superior to all other deities, and then as the sole-existing Deity in the heaven and earth that He had made. The logical implication of this monotheism was that, not Israel only, but all the nations of the earth, were the objects of Yahweh's providential care. It took time for this implication to be clearly seen and accepted; but seen and accepted it certainly was. Amos made a beginning by declaring that Yahweh was just as responsible for the migrations of the Philistines and the Syrians as He was for those of Israel (Am 9^{7}). Isaiah saw a vision of all nations coming to Jerusalem to learn His law (Is 2^{2-4} =Mic 4^{1-3}). Writers of the seventh century show traces of the same general idea (Dt 32^{43}, Ps 87^{4}, Zeph 3^{9}). Jeremiah re-echoes it (Jer 16^{19-21}); while Habakkuk declares that 'the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of Yahweh's glory, as the waters cover the sea' (Hab 2^{14}). In the early exilic period, the author of the 'Servant-Poems' depicts Yahweh's Servant as extending the knowledge of the Divine Law to the eagerly awaiting Gentiles (Is $42^{1.4}$). 'It is too light a thing,' he hears Yahweh saying, 'that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the dispersed of Israel [only]. I will also put thee as a light to the Gentiles, that my salvation may extend to the end of the earth' (Is 49^{6}). Deutero-Isaiah repeats this forecast on his own account (Is 42^{6} $51^{4f.}$; cf. Am 9^{12}). Zechariah reaffirms it amid the returned exiles, 'many nations shall join themselves to Yahweh in that day, and shall be my people' (Zec 2^{11}; cf. $8^{22f.}$). It appears again and again in the post-exilic literature: thus, for instance, 'In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth; inasmuch as Yahweh of hosts will have blessed them, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel my possession' (Is $19^{24f.}$; cf. 19^{18-23}, also $56^{6f.}$ ['My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the peoples'], Jer 3^{17}, Zec $14^{16ff.}$). The two short and beautiful books of Ruth and Jonah were probably written (perhaps round about 400 B.C.) as a protest against the narrow Judaism fostered by the perils and difficulties of the time, and encouraged by the policy, of Ezra and Nehemiah. Universalistic expressions also occur in the late Jewish apocryphal writings (*e.g.* Sibyll. Orac. $3^{652-795}$, esp. $^{767f.}$; To 13^{11} $14^{6f.}$; cf. Schürer, *Gesch.* ii. 593–96 [Eng. tr. II. ii. 139–141]). The best Jewish minds hoped for more than the submission of the Gentile nations to the resurgent empire of Israel: they hoped for the ultimate conversion of these nations to a saving belief in Yahweh and their full participation in His coming Kingdom, and they believed that it was accordingly the duty of Israel to propagate the true faith throughout the world.[1]

In the times in which Jesus lived, this Jewish universalism was still a power. A vigorous proselytism was carried on, and met with very considerable success. The irrepressible inclination to impart to others the religious truth treasured by oneself largely qualified the tendency towards a

[1] Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus*, Eng. tr., ii. 198, 346; Holtzmann, *N.T. Theologie*, i. 277; Hirsch in *Jew. Encyc.*, v. 616*a*; Schürer, *Geschichte*, ii. 629–632 (Eng. tr., II. ii. 172–174), iii. 162 f. (Eng. tr., II. ii. 304); Harnack, *Mission and Expansion*, Eng. tr., i. 16 f.; Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures*, 146–149, 273 f., 371–373.

narrow particularism. There was much in Judaism, with its monotheism and its lofty ethic, to attract serious-minded pagans. The Pharisees of Palestine compassed sea and land in their effort to make one proselyte (Mt 23^{15}). In the Diaspora, the work of propaganda was carried on more actively and successfully still. Proselytes were of several grades: not all were required to accept the full yoke of the Law; and we are told of one Rabbi who even argued that converts might be exempted from the necessity of circumcision. Hillel, the most famous Rabbi of the times immediately before Jesus' ministry, was interested in the propaganda, and said: 'Be ye of the disciples of Aaron, . . . loving mankind, and bringing them nigh to the Law' (*Pirke Abhoth*, i. 12). Gamaliel, Paul's teacher, was another propagandist.[1]

Apart from the teaching of Jesus, there is a certain amount of universalism in the Gospels, reflecting the broader Judaism of the time. Thus John the Baptist repudiates the idea that Jewish descent was any guarantee of a share in God's Messianic blessings (Mt 3^{9}=Lk 3^{8}). In the Lucan narrative of Jesus' infancy, the prayer of the aged Symeon breathes this wider sympathy: 'Mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared in face of all the peoples; a light for revelation to Gentiles, and for the glory of thy people Israel' (Lk 2^{30-32}). This simple Jewish universalism shades off imperceptibly into the Christian universalism which the Church took for granted in the days when the Evangelists wrote. Thus Mark (7^{3}) speaks of the Jews and their customs in a purely external way: Luke carries back the genealogy of Jesus to 'Adam, the son of God' (3^{38}), applies to the Baptist's appearance the prophecy 'All flesh shall see the salvation of God' (3^{6}), and preserves no saying which confines the activities of Jesus to the Jews. Even 'Matthew,' with his Jewish leanings, brings the Gentile astrologers from the East to the Messiah's cradle (Mt 2^{1-12}), specifies 'Galilee of the Gentiles' as the scene of His activities (4^{13-16}), and quotes the universalistic 'Servant-Poems' in connexion with His peaceful public ministry ($12^{18.\ 21}$).[2]

[1] Cf. also Hirsch in *Jew. Encyc.*, v. 221 f., 621*a*, x. 221–223; Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 150–188 (Eng. tr., II. ii. 291–327); Montefiore, *Synopt. Gosp.*, i. lxxxi; Harnack, *loc. cit.* On the whole subject, see also A. Causse, *Israël et la Vision de l'Humanité* (Paris, 1924).

[2] Holtzmann, *loc. cit.*; Harnack, *Mission*, Eng. tr., i. 38–41 (but some of the passages quoted in 41, note 2, are not universalistic).

II. Jewish Particularism.

But alongside this broad human sympathy, and in frequent conflict with it, there ran a stream of bitter and narrow particularism. The sufferings of the Jews at the hands of the Gentiles had generated fierce nationalistic antipathies. After the Exile, the restored Jewish community had scornfully rejected the offer of their neighbours to co-operate in restoring the worship of Yahweh. Ezra and Nehemiah had discountenanced as religious treason marriages with non-Jewish women. The persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes and the ensuing successes of the Maccabæan warrior-princes sharpened Israel's antagonism to the rest of the world. The conquest of Palestine by Pompeius, the long reigns of the semi-foreign Herods and their sons, and the hard government of the Roman procurators, alienated the Jews still further. They came to regard the Gentiles as impious and unclean idolaters—eligible for conversion to Judaism, it is true, but, if converted, obliged to keep the whole Law, and even then admitted only to an inferior status, and if unconverted, deserving only to be despised and avoided. In Jewish apocalyptic, which was at its height in the period during which Jesus lived, the Gentiles usually figured as enemies destined soon to be overthrown and destroyed *en masse*. In the period culminating in A.D. 70, the antipathy to everything non-Jewish was steadily on the increase. One comparatively mild phase of this particularism was the fact that Jewish religious thought concentrated its interest, with an intense and exclusive energy, on the religious concerns of the Chosen People itself, to the tacit neglect of the Gentile world.[3]

As with the universalism, so with the particularism, of the time, we may trace its presence in the Gospels apart from the words of Jesus. John the Baptist, despite his threat that God would not necessarily save the existing children of Abraham, but could, if He wanted to, raise up others, yet seems—by his use of the rite of baptism (which

[3] Cf. Holtzmann, *N.T. Theol.*, i. 96, 277; Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 162 f. (Eng. tr., II. ii. 303 f.); Gwatkin, *Early Church History*, i. 17 f.; Hirsch in *Jew. Encyc.*, v. 616–618, x. 223*b*; Eisenstein, *ibid.*, v. 623*b*; Harnack, *Mission*, Eng. tr., i. 16–18; Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures*, 437. Note also Paul's language in Gal 2^{15}.

was always administered to Jewish proselytes on conversion) and by his general message—to 'have conceived of the Kingdom of God . . . as consisting of a purified Israel—the "wheat" of the nation which should be left after the "chaff" had been winnowed out and consumed by the Messiah.'[1]

The Lucan Infancy-narratives, which depict truly the Jewish piety of the time, contain much more particularism than universalism. Gabriel tells Zachariah that John 'will turn many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God . . . to make ready for the Lord a people prepared for him' (Lk $1^{16f.}$); and he tells Mary that God will give Jesus 'the throne of his father David, and he will reign over the house of Jacob for ever' (Lk $1^{32f.}$; cf. v.^{27}). In the 'Magnificat,' Mary sings: 'He has helped Israel his servant, remembering mercy—as he promised our fathers—(mercy) for Abraham, and for his seed for ever' (Lk $1^{54f.}$). The song of Zachariah at the birth of John is a purely Jewish song of rejoicing, without a single reference to any benefit which God intends to bestow on the Gentiles (Lk 1^{68-79}). The angels tell the shepherds that a Saviour is born for them—the Lord Messiah—in the city of David (Lk 2^{11}); and there is no universalism in the song of the heavenly host, for 'Peace on earth, goodwill towards men' (Lk 2^{14}) is the translation of an inferior reading, the true text giving 'on earth peace among men (divinely) favoured,' *i.e.*, presumably, the Jews among whom this Messiah was born. Symeon was looking for the consolation of Israel (Lk 2^{25}), and told Mary that Jesus was destined to occasion the rise and fall of many in Israel (Lk 2^{34}): the aged Anna spoke of Him 'to all who were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem' (Lk 2^{38}). The parents of Jesus took Him to the Temple to carry out the regulations of the Mosaic Law (Lk 2^{27}), and returned to Galilee only when they had done so (Lk 2^{39}). Thereafter they visit Jerusalem annually for the Passover (Lk $2^{41f.}$). The Gospel of 'Matthew,' needless to say, is saturated with Judaism. Jesus' descent is traced from Abraham through David and the kings of Judah (Mt 1^{1-17}). Joseph, his legal father, is addressed as 'Son of David' (Mt 1^{20}). Jesus is born 'King of the Jews' (Mt 2^{2}), and is destined to 'save *his people* from their sins' (Mt 1^{21}). According to the old prophet, God had declared to Bethlehem: 'Out of thee shall come a ruler, who shall shepherd my people Israel' (Mt 2^{6}). The Gospel speaks of Jerusalem as 'the Holy City' (Mt 4^{5}), describes the crowds praising the 'God of Israel' (Mt 15^{31}), and shows us Jesus fulfilling innumerable Old Testament prophecies, among others that which ran: 'Say to the daughter of Zion, Behold! thy king comes to thee . . .' (Mt $21^{4f.}$). The disciples of Jesus, not to mention His fellow-countrymen generally, are obsessed with particularistic sympathies. He is addressed as 'Son of David' (Mt 9^{27} 15^{22} 21^{15}, Mk 10^{48}||s, $11^{9f.}$||; cf. Mt 12^{23}), and 'Holy One' (or 'Son') 'of God,' *i.e.* Jewish Messiah (Mk 1^{24}|| 3^{11} 5^{7}||s, 8^{29}||s; cf. Lk 4^{41}|| and 7^{16} ['God has visited his people']). After His resurrection, the two on the road to Emmaus confess that they had hoped that it would be He who was destined to redeem Israel (Lk 24^{21}), and the Twelve inquire of Him whether that was the time when He would restore the kingdom to Israel (Ac 1^{7}).

[1] G. B. Stevens, *Theol. of N.T.*, 37.

III. The Judaism of Jesus.

Such being the context within which the Gospel-story is told, we have now to inquire what was our Lord's own personal attitude, and firstly, how far it was characterized by a Judaistic particularism.

(*a*) Taking first those statements, whose historical truth we have no reason to doubt—we may begin with the fact that Jesus was born and brought up as a Palestinian Jew among Palestinian Jews, or, as Paul would have said: 'A Hebrew (sprung) from Hebrews.' He commences His public life with the clear, though unpublished, conviction that He is God's Messiah, *i.e.* a leader with a distinctively national rôle: He admitted at the end of His life that He was 'the king of the Jews' (Mk 15^{2}||s). He virtually confined His whole activity to Jewish soil. He chose twelve disciples, with evident reference to the number of the Hebrew tribes,[2] as is clear from His words: 'Ye shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel' (Mt 19^{28}=Lk 22^{30} Q). He takes it for granted that the Jews as a whole are to be His disciples,[3] and that the Gentiles are outsiders. Thus He often uses the word 'brother' in the sense of 'fellow-disciple' (Mt 7^{3-5}=Lk $6^{41f.}$; Mt 18^{15} ($^{21f.}$)= Lk $17^{3(4)}$: both Q): and there is abundant evidence

[2] Harnack, *Mission*, Eng. tr., i. 38; Jacobs, in *Jew. Encyc.* vii. 162*b*.

[3] See Mess, *Studies in the Christian Gospel for Society*, 19, 32; Gore, *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, 42–45, 61.

to prove that 'brother' on Jewish lips regularly meant 'fellow-Jew' as distinct from the alien Gentile (Ex 2^{11} 4^{18}, Nu 32^{6}, Dt 10^{9} $15^{2f.}$ $17^{15.\,20}$ 18^{2} $23^{19f.}$ 24^{7}, Jer 34^{14}, Ac $2^{29.\,37}$ 3^{17} 7^{2} 22^{5} 28^{21}, Ro 9^{3}).[1] He is specially interested in the salvation of Zacchæus, 'forasmuch as even he is a son of Abraham' (Lk 19^{9}), and the healing of the crippled woman, because she is 'a daughter of Abraham' (Lk 13^{16}).[2] Lazarus, the beggar, is taken at death to Abraham's bosom (Lk $16^{22f.}$). Again, Jesus counsels His followers to avoid characteristically Gentile shortcomings, such as worrying about the future (Mt 6^{32} = Lk 12^{30} Q) and domineering over their subordinates (Mk 10^{42} ||s). The herd of swine which He handed over to the legion of demons was Gentile property (Mk 5^{11-13} ||s). Once, when on Gentile soil He was appealed to by a Phœnician woman to heal her afflicted daughter, He hesitated to do so, on the ground that it was not right to take the children's bread and throw it to the dogs (Mk 7^{27} = Mt 15^{26}). 'Dogs' was a fairly frequent Jewish term for Gentiles; and it is far-fetched to suggest that Jesus' hesitation was purposely assumed by Him in order to try the woman's faith.[3] The Gentiles figure in Jesus' third prophecy of His death, as those to whom He will be handed over (Mk 10^{33} ||s): in His great eschatological discourse they appear as rising in war, one nation against another (Mk 13^{8} ||s [? 'little apocalypse']: also Lk 21^{25}), and as destined to tread down Jerusalem and enslave the Jews for a certain appointed period (Lk 21^{24}).

[1] Cf. Hatch, *Organiz. of Early Christian Churches*, 44; Harnack, *Mission*, Eng. tr., i. 406 n.; Farrar in *Smith's D.B.*, i. 230 *b*. Many of Jesus' sayings about the extension of the Kingdom to outsiders of one sort or another have reference, not to the Gentiles, but to *Jewish* tax-collectors, prostitutes, and sinners (Mt 21^{28-32} 22^{9}, Lk 18^{9-14}; cf. Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. 39 note 2). On the limited numbers of those who should enter the Kingdom, see Lk 13^{24} = Mt 7^{14}: Shailer Mathews' objection (*Social Teaching of Jesus*, 200) is beside the point.

[2] Cf. The words which, according to the Gospel *καθ' Ἑβραίους*, Jesus addressed to the rich young ruler: 'fratres tui, filii Abrahae.'

[3] Wendt, *Teaching*, ii. 198; Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. 39 top. Cf. the remarks of F. Heiler in *Der Katholizismus*, 32 f.: 'Auch in Jesu Seele liess dieser grosse Gedanke des Gottesvolkes tiefe Spüren zurück; auch in seinem Wirken offenbart sich diese jüdische Exklusivität . . . Das kananäische Weib . . . weist er mit der harten Bemerkung zurück: "Ich bin nur zu den verlorenen Schafen des Hauses Israel gesandt."'

With the leading Jews, on the contrary, Jesus was often on friendly terms: He is invited to dinner by a Pharisee (Lk 7^{36}), enters the house of another Pharisee—a ruler—to eat bread (Lk 14^{1}), looks upon the rich young ruler and loves him (Mk 10^{21}; cf. Lk 18^{18} [*ἄρχων*]), and enters into friendly conversation with a sympathetic scribe, whom He declares in the end to be not far from the Kingdom of God (Mk 12^{28-34}; cf. Lk 10^{25-28}). He venerates the Jewish Scriptures, finding in them strength against temptation (Mt $4^{4.\,7.\,10}$ = Lk $4^{4.\,12.\,8}$ Q), quotes the Mosaic commandment to honour father and mother as having Divine authority (Mk $7^{9f.\,13}$ = Mt $15^{3f.\,6}$), and declares that heaven and earth should pass away before one fragment of the Law should do so (Mt 5^{18}, Lk 16^{17}, ? Q), and that men ought to have kept the weightier matters of the Law, and not to have left the lesser commandments —like those dealing with the tithing of herbs— undone (Mt 23^{23} || Lk 11^{42} Q). He wore on the corners of His outer cloak the violet tassels which the Law required every pious Jew to wear, in order to remind Him of God's commandments (Mk 6^{56} = Mt 14^{36}, Mt 9^{20} = Lk 8^{44}; cf. Nu 15^{37-41}, Dt 22^{12}, Mt 23^{5}).[4] As for the Temple and its worship, Jesus venerates the sanctity of the place, resents its desecration (Mk $11^{11ff.}$ ||s), and teaches habitually in its courts (Mk 12^{35} 14^{49}, etc. ||s).[5] He sends the cured leper to offer the sacrifices that Moses commanded, in connexion with his curing (Mk 1^{44} ||s). At intervals during His ministry He visited Jerusalem on the occasion of the great national festivals (see Fourth Gospel, *passim*); and, whether the Last Supper was a Passover-meal or not, it is certain that Jesus *desired* to eat the Passover (Mk $14^{12ff.}$ ||s; Lk 22^{15}). Though comparing His own message to new wine, He yet declared: 'No one having drunk old wine wishes for new: for he says, The old is good' (Lk 5^{39}: not in the parallels).

(*b*) So far we have confined ourselves to passages

[4] The exact force of Mt 11^{13} || Lk 16^{16} (? Q) in this general connexion is not clear. Cf. Heiler, *Der Katholizismus*, 26 f., and Lightley, *Jewish Sects and Parties*, 115–118.

[5] Cf. Heiler, *op. cit.*, 30 f.: 'Dem durch das Gesetz sanktionierten Tempelkult auf dem Sion gegenüber nimmt Jesus eine ähnliche Stellung ein wie gegenüber dem Gesetz selbst. Mit seinen Volksgenossen teilt Jesus die ehrfürchtige Liebe zum Heiligtum in Jerusalem . . . Der Tempel ist wirklich Gottes Haus und Wohnstätte,' etc. See Lk 2^{49}.

of almost unimpeachable historical accuracy. We can hardly challenge the reliability of Q, while Mark and Luke, writing mainly for Gentile readers, would scarcely admit to their pages particularistic sayings that did not rest on good authority. It is different, however, with statements resting on the unsupported testimony of 'Matthew,' in view of the abundant traces which that Gospel shows of having been compiled under various doctrinal influences so strong as frequently to impair its trustworthiness on points of fact. The explanation of the data furnished by it is materially helped by the theory, recently put forward by Dr. Streeter, that its composition was meant to be a compromise between the Paulinist and Judaistic elements in the Church at Antioch, and that it was accordingly based partly on Mark (the Roman Gospel), partly on Q (the logia compiled by the Apostle Matthew), and partly on a Jerusalem collection of incidents and sayings (Streeter's 'M') produced during the period A.D. 45–65, when the Jewish-Christian leaders were in fierce conflict with Paul over the Gentile-mission and the Mosaic Law, and bearing distinct marks of that conflict in the form given to many of Jesus' utterances.[1] Most of the material peculiar to 'Matthew' probably comes from M: much of it is clearly genuine tradition; but some of its sayings can hardly have been spoken by Jesus, while they are easily explicable as anti-Pauline 'dicta' believed to have the Master's authority behind them.

(*c*) We find among the probably reliable excerpts from M much that simply confirms our previous conclusions. Thus Jesus assumes His followers to be simply pious Jews as such. He tells them what to do when they are fasting (Mt 6^{16}; cf. Mk 9^{29} v.l.), or when they are 'conscribed' by some government-official to transport baggage, etc. (Mt 5^{41}). He warns them against offences punishable by the Jewish law-courts (Mt $5^{21f.}$): He assumes that they will know and speak of each other as 'brothers,' *i.e.* fellow-Jews (Mt $5^{22-24.\ 47}$ [contrast Lk $6^{33f.}$, 'sinners' substituted for 'Gentiles'] 18^{15-17}; cf. Mt 25^{40} 28^{10}, Lk 22^{32}): He tells them not to pray like the Gentiles (Mt $6^{7f.}$), who later on will hate them as His followers (Mt 24^{9}: contrast the parallels). He calls Jerusalem 'the city of the great King' (Mt 5^{35}), *i.e.* of God, pictures His disciples offering their sacrifices at the altar (Mt $5^{23f.}$), pronounces in regard to the oaths sworn by the Temple, the altar, and the sacrifice (Mt 23^{16-22}; cf. Heiler, *loc. cit.*), and pays the Temple-tax (Mt 17^{24-27}).[2] The saying, 'Every scribe that has been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven is like a householder who brings out of his store things new and old' (Mt 13^{52}), does not well fit its present setting, and probably refers, not metaphorically to the Twelve, but literally to Jewish scribes who listened sympathetically to Jesus' teaching.[3] Again, when Jesus says to the Jews, 'The Kingdom will be taken from you and given to a nation producing the fruits of it' (Mt 21^{43}), He implies that He had previously regarded the Kingdom as the possession of the Jews (cf. Mt 8^{12} ['sons of the kingdom'] and $13^{38.\ 41}$).

(*d*) The following sayings, however, which are also peculiar to 'Matthew,' look very much as if they had been put into our Lord's mouth in the heat of the Jewish-Christian controversy with Paul: 'Whoever cancels one of the least of these commandments and teaches men so, will be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whoever does and teaches them, he will be called great in the kingdom of heaven' (Mt 5^{19}): 'Beware of false prophets, who come to you clad like sheep; but inwardly they are ravening wolves' (Mt 7^{15}): 'Depart not by the road (leading) to the Gentiles, and enter not into (any) city of the Samaritans; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. . . . Ye will not have finished the cities of Israel before the Son of man has come' (Mt $10^{5f\ 23}$):[4]

[1] Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 230–270. The theory has the merit of solving what Dr. Moffatt (*Introduction*, 255) has called 'the main problem of the gospel,' viz. the juxtaposition of particularistic and universalistic sayings. It also helps to explain why certain recorded sayings in 'Matthew' and Luke, though clearly parallel, are too dissimilar to be naturally assigned to a single source, Q: 'Matthew' either drew from M, or conflated M and Q, while Luke used Q only.

[2] The conversation of Mt $17^{25f.}$, implying that Jesus and His followers are sons of God, while the Jews are foreigners, is remote from the thought of Jesus, and therefore probably a piece of early Christian, anti-Jewish polemic (see McNeile, *Matthew*, 258 f.).

[3] McNeile, *Matthew*, 205 f.

[4] Harnack, *Mission*, Eng. tr., i. 38; Wendt, *Teaching*, Eng. tr., ii. 197. The explanation of Mt 10^{23} suggested above, viz. that the words represent the views of those Christian propagandists who, in opposition to Paul, advocated concentration on Israel in view of the proximity of the Parousia, seems far more

'I was not sent except to the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mt 15^{24}).[1] 'Give not what is holy to the dogs, nor cast your pearls before the swine, lest they tread them down with their feet, and then turn and tear you' (Mt 7^{6}).

(*e*) The following sayings are not so clearly anti-Pauline as those quoted above, but seem to represent rather the Judaism of the early Jerusalem Church than that of Jesus Himself: 'Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets; I came not to destroy, but to fulfil' (Mt 5^{17}): the Matthæan version of the passage about the narrow gate (Mt $7^{13f.}$; contrast Lk $13^{23f.}$): 'The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. All things therefore that they tell you, do and observe,' etc. (Mt $23^{2f.}$): 'All ye are brothers' (Mt 23^{8}): 'Pray that your flight be not on the Sabbath' (Mt 24^{20}).[2] The passage about appealing to the Church against the offending brother and treating him, if he refuse to hear, as a Gentile and a tax-collector (Mt 18^{15-17}), may be regarded either (1) as a real saying of Jesus, in which He is simply referring to His disciples as Jews habitually assembling in a synagogue,[3] or (2) as a piece of early Church-Law, ascribed to Jesus, but actually emanating from the times and conditions after His death.[4] The description of the Last Judgment in Mt 25^{31-46} (sheep and goats) has difficulties of its own; but one plausible view is that it is an attempt on the part of the Early Church to explain on what principles the unevangelized Gentiles would finally be judged. The answer given in this passage is that they will be judged according to the way in which they have treated oppressed and needy Christians. We note that those judged are described as 'all the nations,' *i.e.* the Gentiles, and the recipients of their kindness or their neglect are described by the Son of Man as His 'brothers.' The description, in any case, presupposes the existence of many Gentiles who had never heard of Jesus.[5]

(*f*) Finally, it seems clear that Jesus did not give to the disciples any clear or definite instructions actively to evangelize the Gentile world, though doubtless (as we shall see in the next article) His view of the Kingdom really *implied* such an evangelization. Had He given an explicit charge, it would be very hard to understand why the Jerusalem-Church should have been so slow to take any steps in that direction, and should have even put hindrances in the way of it when it was at length seriously undertaken. Paul apparently knew nothing of any such general commandment.[6]

(*To be continued.*)

probable than that suggested by Rev. T. H. Weir in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for February 1926, p. 237.

[1] Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. 39, note 1. Observe that, in the Matthæan version of the story of the Phœnician woman (in contrast to the Marcan), Jesus does not actually go on to Gentile soil at all: the woman comes thence to Him (Mt $15^{21f.}$; contrast Mk $7^{24f.}$: cf. McNeile, *Matthew*, 230).

[2] Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. 39, note 2.

[3] Here called ἐκκλησία, as was occasionally the custom (see Schürer, *Geschichte*, ii. 504f. note [Eng. tr., II. ii. 58 f.], and Oman in Hastings' *Encyclop.* iii. 617 f.).

[4] So, strongly, Heiler, *Katholizismus*, 42 f.

[5] Wendt, *Teaching*, Eng. tr., ii. 349.

[6] Cf. Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. 38, 40 f., also *Origin of the N.T.*, 45 f.; Wendt, *op. cit.*, ii. 348–351; W. Hobhouse, *The Church and the World*, 348–350; S. Mathews, *Social Teaching*, 201 top. See further on this point the second article.

Literature.

THE SCOTTISH LAYMAN'S LIBRARY.

FOUR new volumes of this series have just appeared. The first of the four in interest, and, probably, in ability, is *Principal Caird*, by the Rev. Charles L. Warr, minister of St. Giles' Cathedral, Edinburgh. No one need shrink from this book in fear of a profound disquisition on Hegelian philosophy. The author was warned off this ground, the book being designed for 'the ordinary laity.' The object of the author was the delineation of a portrait framed in the setting of an era. In both these respects he has been singularly successful. Indeed, one of the most admirable features of this biography is the description of the background on which the famous churchman lived his life. The times are sketched in with as much fulness as was possible in the space, and we see clearly in what conditions both of the nation

nerally and of the Church in particular Principal aird conducted his long, varied, and influential inistry in church and university. The in-uence of the Principal is described in pardonably xaggerated terms ('It was nothing short of the perating of the fettered soul of a nation'), but such nthusiasm is not altogether a fault in a sympathetic iographer. There are two slight defects in the ook. There ought to be an index for such a book. nd perhaps the Disruption movement might have een referred to in more sympathetic or under-anding terms.

This latter defect is remedied in the second of ne four volumes, *Secession Memories: The United Presbyterian Contribution to the Scottish Church*, by he Rev. J. H. Leckie, D.D. Dr. Leckie is favour-bly known by a number of admirably written ooks, both in pure theology and in church history. He wields a light and interesting pen, and this new olume is packed full of interest. It is intended to ketch the rise and fortunes of the Church which egan with the Erskines and ended in the generation hat united with the United Free Church in 1900. his motive is carried out in a series of biographical ketches. In no better way could the theme have een so well developed, and in Dr. Leckie's hands t becomes a fascinating story. In particular one ees clearly why these secessions, which began enerally as a testimony to tradition, grew to be eally a fountain of advance and revolution. This ook will provide edifying and delightful reading or many Scottish homes.

The other two volumes may be dismissed in fewer words, not because their merits are less, but because heir contents are too varied to be concisely escribed.

The Church at Work, by the Rev. David Watson, D.D., is a description of the multifarious activities of the Church. And it is more. Dr. Watson has rightly allowed himself some liberty, and at many points is really dealing with the social and religious developments not of the Church, but of the Christian religion. Dr. Watson is widely known for his interest in social problems and the Church's relation to these. It is not surprising that he writes sympathetically of the changed attitude to such matters. The Church, he contends, has a real social conscience and a real social gospel and duty. It would surprise and confound many who speak as though the Church did nothing for the social well-being of the people if they read this book and discovered how varied and widespread and fruitful these services are. This seems to us the best piece of work Dr. Watson has done.

Finally, there is a shrewd and sensible volume on the Book of Proverbs—*Salt and Sense; or, Gems from the Book of Proverbs*, by the Rev. W. S. Bruce, D.D. Dr. Bruce has written quite a lot, one of his best efforts being 'The Nor'-East.' The book on Proverbs is quite in line with that racy volume. The author is a wise and experienced parish minister, and has a knowledge of life that is both wide and deep. He was just the man to elucidate the wise and witty sayings of Proverbs. In a series of thirty odd chapters he has given us the wisdom of the ancient book on all sorts of subjects—the home, woman, sloth, friendship, the tongue, and so on. We commend the book to any who wish either to understand or to expound (or both!) the Hebrew collection of 'Salt and Sense.'

The publishers are Messrs. T. & T. Clark, and the price of each volume is 5s. net.

HISTORY OF RELIGIONS.

Dr. T. H. Robinson, Lecturer in Semitic Languages of the University of Cardiff, already well known for excellent work on both Old and New Testament, has again shown his power to combine scholarship with popular exposition in *An Outline Introduction to the History of Religions* (Oxford University Press; 5s. net). His first-hand knowledge of India as well as his wide acquaintance with Semitic literature inspires the reader with a confidence, which is not disappointed, that the discussion will be based upon fact and not upon airy speculation. No man, of course, as Dr. Robinson admits, can have an intimate acquaintance with all the great religions, but he has submitted all his discussions to expert criticism, so that the general sketch is one on which we may confidently rely.

Among the subjects discussed are animism, animatism, polytheism, monotheism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Islam, and Christianity. The beliefs presupposed by each system, especially of Buddhism, Islam, and Christianity, are sympathetically and succinctly set forth and their value appraised. The brevity of the treatment necessarily confines the discussion of each type of religion to its most salient characteristics—which is as it should be in an 'Outline'; but brief as the treatment is, it has body enough to be not only alive, but intelligible.

It is often, too, refreshingly frank: for example, of the creeds which enshrine the doctrine of three 'Persons' within the being of God, Dr. Robinson has the courage to say that they 'produced a formula which probably very few can claim fully to understand'; and there is an interesting hesitancy about the sentence, 'God suffers; that is *perhaps* [italics ours] the centre of what Christianity has to offer the world.' But against this has to be set the important statement that all sections of the Christian Church 'agree, however different in detail the theories may be, that it is the death of Christ which gives to Christianity its supreme message,' and that 'its universal, indeed its only possible, symbol is a Cross.' This competent book furnishes a fine initiation into the more detailed study of the history of the world's religions.

FUNDAMENTAL CHRISTIANITY.

A book which bears the name of Dr. Francis L. Patton, formerly President of Princeton University, cannot be called unimportant. And in point of fact the 'James Sprunt' lectures, which are published under the title *Fundamental Christianity* (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net), are, in their way, important. They are also interesting and a little bewildering. The general point of view defended in the book is that of traditional orthodoxy. Sin, for example, Dr. Patton seems to think, was preordained: 'We may be sure that the entrance of sin into the world made no change in the plans of Providence, and was no surprise to the Almighty, being already embraced in the divine plan which left no place for contingency.' That is the pure milk of a Calvinism which religious thought has largely passed by. Similarly Dr. Patton has severe things to say of the Higher Criticism: 'It is not denied that a plausible account of Old Testament history can be made out by forced chronology, minute linguistic appreciation, and *a priori* arguments based on antisupernatural beliefs.' Dr. Patton also is completely sound on the Pauline theology, or perhaps we should say soundly traditional. Yet on the other hand with surprising breadth he repudiates the idea that belief in the verbal infallibility of Scripture is essential to Christianity. And, indeed, nowhere in the book does he commit himself to a very definite theory of inspiration. The Bible is the Word of God to him, and he accepts all its statements. Behind his doctrinal beliefs it would seem necessary to have a belief in the verbal inspiration of Scripture, and probably Dr. Patton does hold this himself though he makes room in his charity for other views. There are five massive lectures in a fairly big volume, the subjects of which are 'The Theistic View of the World,' 'The Seat of Authority in Religion,' 'The New Christianity,' 'The Person of Christ,' and 'The Pauline Theology.' There are many good things in the volume, apt illustrations and epigrammatic definitions. But the weakness of the book, to write frankly, is that it is often gnawing at the old bone and getting very little meat off it. In the first lecture, for example, we have a great deal about antitheistic theories, but nothing very helpful. On materialism, for example, which presents a plausible case to youthful minds, Dr. Patton is singularly unhelpful. An inquirer would get far more help from the few pages on the subject in Professor Laird's little book 'Our Minds and their Bodies.' In the chapter on 'The Seat of Authority in Religion,' again, we have the three old subjects, Reason, the Church, and the Bible, discussed as sources of authority. But there is not much said that has not often and often been said. It cannot but be useful that the position of traditional orthodoxy should be expounded by so thoughtful a mind as Dr. Patton's. And no one can read this restatement and defence of old beliefs without sympathy and appreciation. There is a loyal faith in the gospel behind all these pages, and for that we are profoundly thankful.

METHODISM AND MODERN PROBLEMS.

In *Methodism and Modern World Problems* (Methuen; 7s. 6d. net), Mr. R. Wilberforce Allen 'indicates the attitude of Methodism to the more important problems — international, industrial, social, and ecclesiastical—which confront the world to-day,' and he is at the same time a critic, and, though a friendly one, often very searching. He deals with the Methodist attitude towards women and the Churches, the Christian Sunday, education, the use and mis-use of money, alcoholism, betting and gambling, Christian reunion and international relations. The book is full of ripe wisdom, and should be thought-provoking not only to members of the Methodist Church, but also to those who belong to other branches of the Christian communion.

In the chapter on the use and mis-use of money,

Mr. Allen is very definitely critical. 'It is idle to deny that money counts for far more than it ought to do in almost every branch of the Church, and a Methodist may be permitted to say that no communion is more open to criticism in that respect than is Methodism. . . . So far as the making of money is concerned it must suffice to say here that no Church ought to tolerate the presence of men who have become wealthy by taking advantage of the needs and misfortunes of others. Nothing would go further to alleviate discontent amongst the great "dispossessed" than the universal application of this principle. Reference to the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard will shew what is meant here. The men who were employed at the eleventh hour were paid the same wage as those who had been working all day. Why? They had been standing all the day idle, but only because no man had hired them. They were willing to work and so were paid for their willingness. Their unfortunate position was not exploited to depress the wages of others for their own. The identical application of this principle is obviously difficult to-day, but the principle itself remains and its application to modern industrial conditions would be revolutionary in its effect. It would rule out once for all the amassing of wealth out of the necessities and misfortunes of others, whether by underpaying employees or taking undue advantage of a temporary or permanent monopoly.'

What, Mr. Allen suggests, is needed to-day is a Church prepared fearlessly to proclaim and exercise its disciplinary powers in regard to those of its members who make money in ways that will not bear investigation in the light of our Lord's teaching.

THE PSALMS.

Professor J. M. P. Smith, who has done much to advance the scientific study of the Old Testament in America, has published a translation of *The Psalms* (Cambridge University Press; 15s. net). A brief introduction deals with questions of the date, the poetry, and the religion of the Psalter. In this he frankly says—and Duhm has committed himself to the same view—that the Psalter, like other hymn-books, is necessarily 'not representative of the best thought and the highest idealism of its age, but rather the ideas and ideals of the man on the street.'

While Professor Smith takes full advantage of such material as is available for the emendation of the text, he does not make wanton use of it. His 'aim has been rather to accept the official text where it was susceptible of translation and made reasonable sense.' This explains the retention of the phrase in Ps 91^{6}, 'nor the plague *that wastes at noonday*,' where the true reading of the italicized words is, probably, 'nor the demon of noon'; it doubtless also explains the 'creatures small and great go there *like ships*' of 104^{25}, where many scholars emend 'ships' (without the 'like') into 'sea-monsters.' On the other hand, Professor Smith accepts the transposition of letters in 73^{24b}, which turns 'afterwards thou wilt take me to glory' into 'by the hand thou dost take me after thee.' The changes which he accepts or suggests are sometimes striking: for example, for 'we bring our years to an end like a sigh' in 90^{9}, we get the different, but equally impressive picture, 'we come to an end: our years are like a cobweb wiped away.' Dr. Smith has not disdained the use of paraphrase, whose gains, he argues, 'are more than offset by its losses.' For 'fear' he sometimes substitutes 'revere' or 'be reverent' (52^{6} 130^{4}); this secures a meaning which commends itself more to the modern mind, but perhaps at the expense of eliminating the 'numinous' idea involved in the word, which Otto has stressed. The translation is accurate rather than beautiful; whatever may be possible in America, it is doubtful if in Britain we should readily write, in so noble a psalm as $139^{(13)}$, 'Thou didst create my *vitals*.' But any one who desires to see what a very capable scholar, who has all the critical apparatus at his finger-ends, makes of the Psalter will find it here.

CAN GOD SUFFER?

Is God's essential nature a calm, sunlit sea, untouched by all the storms that beat upon us here, and with no sob nor moaning in it? Does His vision of the meaning of those sore dispensations that seem to us so inexplicable, and His foreknowledge of the end, preclude all agony and sympathy with suffering folk? The Archbishops' Doctrinal Commission of 1924 commissioned the Rev. J. K. Mozley, B.D., to lay before it what the Church has taught down the centuries on this; and, continuing his studies, he has now published the result, *The Impassibility of God* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. 6d. net). The work appears to fill a staring gap. Its author knows of only two monographs on the subject, one belonging to the third

century, and one to the late nineteenth! Even the Germans have left this field unworked, and the only authority upon the history of the doctrine in English is Principal Franks' article in the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS.

Mr. Mozley throws his net wide, and it has close meshes. From the Apostolic Fathers to the latest works all are examined, though Mr. Wells is passed by with the cold comment, 'it does not fall within the scope of a survey limited to *Christian* theology.' One agrees with the author that it seems a pity Abelard does not touch much, if at all, upon the subject, for Abelard to some of us is among the most human of theologians, not only in his frailties, but in his theologizings. The main impression of the book is how notable, seen against the historical background, is the present-day revolt against this doctrine of the Impassibility of God. Amid much that is disheartening, let us encourage ourselves where we justly can. And there is this to say, with truth. No generation has ever laid such stress on the self-sacrifice and suffering sympathy of God since Apostolic days.

The First Age of Christianity, by the Rev. E. F. Scott, D.D. (Allen & Unwin; 5s. 6d. net), is 'intended primarily as introductory to the study of Christian origins from the modern point of view,' though a hope is expressed 'that it may also be of service to more advanced scholars who wish to collect and harmonize their knowledge.' The field covered is very wide, including the Historical Background, the Gospel Record, the Life and Teaching of Jesus, the Primitive Church, and the Development of New Testament Thought. Dr. Scott's competence in this field will be questioned by none, and as a bird's-eye view the present book is a masterly piece of work. Vital points are touched with a sure hand, and the lights and shades are skilfully delineated. The style is singularly lucid, and no reader can at any point be in doubt as to the writer's meaning. Unfortunately the treatment of each topic is necessarily so brief that the impression is frequently given of bare assertions unsupported by any sort of proof. Some of the positions taken by Dr. Scott are very open to criticism, and could not fairly be classed as among 'the assured results of biblical scholarship.' On other points there may be noted an inclination towards a conservative position. In regard to Jesus' premonition of His death, 'it has often been taken for granted that he commenced his work under bright auspices and never suspected till near the end that he would meet with disaster. But at no time can he thus have misjudged his prospects. The fate of John was always before his eyes, and he knew that sooner or later he must expect to suffer likewise.' In making the Cross central the Early Church neither obscured nor distorted the real teaching of Jesus. 'In placing the emphasis on the redeeming death the Apostles were true to the implications of Jesus' own thought. He believed that through his death, and not otherwise, he would attain to his destined place and accomplish his work.'

The Professor of Philosophy in Haverford College, U.S.A., Dr. Rufus M. Jones, has written a second autobiography of his childhood. The first was called a 'Boy's Religion from Memory.' It passed through a number of editions, and now after the lapse of years Dr. Jones has decided not to have it reprinted, but rather to tell the story over again, with added material, and to this he gives the title *Finding the Trail of Life* (Allen & Unwin; 5s.). He sets out to do two things, and he does them well. The first is to show how a boy's life was formed. He insists that he was an average boy, and that the average boy is more 'concerned over his spiritual condition than he is over anything else, though nobody knows it or suspects it. . . . I am convinced, too, by my own life and by wide observation of children, that mystical experience is much more common than is usually supposed.' Dr. Jones' second purpose is to preserve the memory of the form of Quakerism, under whose influence he passed his childhood. One outstanding characteristic of it was the visits of itinerant Friends who came from far and near. They came with a 'concern' for those they visited, and when they came there was 'an "opportunity," or a "tunity" as we children named it, when we were too small to pronounce both ends of a long word. The choice of this word indicates a happy insight and shrewd wisdom on the part of those who used the word, for an "opportunity," put in plain, cold language, was nothing more or less than a religious meeting held in the home by the ministering Friend, who was "visiting families."'

A distinctive note of Quakerism, then, as now, was its silences. 'It does not seem necessary

to explain Quaker silence to children. They feel what it means. They do not know how to use very long periods of hush, but there is something in short, living, throbbing times of silence which finds the child's submerged life and stirs it to nobler living and holier aspiration.'

In *A Popular History of the Free Churches* (Congregational Union of England and Wales; 5s. net), the Rev. C. Silvester Horne, M.A., though dead yet speaketh to a younger generation. The History was first published during his lifetime, and has been frequently reprinted. This re-issue of a popular edition contains an additional chapter by the Rev. Albert Peel, M.A., Litt.D., summarizing the history of the Free Churches during the past quarter of a century, a period associated with notable events and changes in the domestic concerns of all religious denominations and in their relations with one another. Dr. Peel has made admirable use of the limited space at his command. He gives a shrewd and sound estimate of tendencies theological, denominational, social, and political. 'It is probably true,' he says, 'that the Free Churches have less political influence at the moment than at any time during the past century.' But against this probable estimate may we not set the statement that 'there are not lacking those who would count the increased emphasis on the social message of the Church as the outstanding feature of the period.' Moreover, if we hear nothing in these days of Disestablishment of the State Churches, is it not because we have heard and seen so much more about the notable and successful efforts towards the union of long-severed religious denominations? The more prominent positions now conceded to women in the work of the Free Churches is likewise an outstanding advance on the first quarter of the century. They 'now not only do the work they have done so well before, but are trained as ministers, elected as deacons and officers, and called to equal service with men.'

Miss L. Wemyss Rhodes has written a number of charming little parables, which have now been published by the C. W. Daniel Company, with the title *On the Top of the Pillars* (2s. 6d. net). The little book is attractively bound in blue with gold lettering, and would make a suitable Christmas gift. The parables are short, but they are suggestive. This is what Miss Rhodes says on 'Black and White' (perhaps we might have found other parables whose message was more necessary for to-day, as our danger surely is not dogmatic statement, but a lack of all clear-cut distinctions. Though this is true, so is the moral of 'Black and White').

'"I want to paint a picture," said a small child. "Then, here is a paint-box," said a grown-up companion. Colours were quickly prepared, but after a few moments the silence was broken: 'This paint-box is no use." "Why is that?", asked the elder one. "Because there are no black or white paints." "You do not need them." "I want to paint the clouds white," said the small child. "They are not white. Use shades of grey and mauve and yellow." . . . "The tree trunks are black. I have no black paint." "Surely," said the elder one, "you have noticed that green moss and the brown and silvery lichen on the bark and the golden patches of sunlight."

'The street orator stood on a lorry and with a clenched fist struck the palm of his other hand. The flare from a naphtha lamp disclosed the dour features of a small crowd below him. The damp and darkness of a November night blotted out the surrounding square of sordid houses. "I tell you," said the orator, "that my opponent is totally in the wrong. He blinds himself to evidence that is patent to all. There can be no two opinions on the subject. Let us come to undoubted facts. I like to call a spade a spade. I will put the whole controversy before you so that you may see it in plain black and white."'

The Rev. J. Paterson Smyth, B.D., LL.D., Litt.D., is widely known as one who possesses in the highest degree the gift of popular exposition. He can make his subject clear as daylight even to the man in the street. In publishing *Myself and Other Problems* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net) he desires it to be 'clearly understood that this is a series of simple studies for ordinary thoughtful laymen.' The problems dealt with are in three groups, first a group of moral problems, such as Conscience, Evil, and Pain, second a group of Biblical problems, the Creation and Fall, the Virgin Birth and Christ's Temptation, and lastly, problems of Myself when I am Dead. The treatment is admirably fitted to fulfil the writer's intention. He is a born teacher, who can see his subject from the point of view of those whom he would instruct. He can speak in the tongue of the plain man, and quicken his mind to fresh thought.

Best of all, he is a man of faith who, having found for himself the true and living Way, is able to speak sure words of guidance to fellow-travellers on the road.

Many attempts are being made to render the narrative of the Gospels in simple language, and some of them are highly successful. *The Story of Jesus, as told to the Children,* by Miss Mary Francis, L.L.A. (Lindsey Press; 1s. 6d.), can be awarded only a modified praise. On its own lines it is exceedingly well done. But unfortunately these lines do not always coincide with those of the Evangelists. The Nature miracles are refined away by rewriting the narrative. In the Stilling of the Storm, for example, Jesus is made to say 'Peace, be still' to the *disciples*. It was the disciples who said afterwards that Jesus had spoken to the waves. Again, the disciples only thought they saw Jesus walking on the sea, the fact being that (unknown to them, but apparently known to Miss Francis) they were quite near the shore. These are examples of the way narratives are sometimes twisted about. The most serious defect of the 'story,' however, is that the writer apparently does not believe that Jesus rose from the dead. In her last chapter, 'Afterwards,' Jesus is spoken of as existing only in the memories of His followers. There is much that is beautiful in this book, but it is not the Jesus of the Gospels that is depicted here.

Among the many Roman Catholic treatises that are at present pouring from a busy press, one of the most attractive is *The Four Mysteries of the Faith,* by the Right Rev. Monsignor Kolbe, D.D., D.Litt. (Longmans; 6s. net). No one could help being affected by the humility and modesty of the author. And, however alien his beliefs in detail may be from ours, at least we must praise the delightful style of his argument. He writes for Romanists, so that his book is not controversial. It is not even apologetic, except in so far as the exposition of a belief is an apologetic. The Four Mysteries are the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Church, and the Sacraments. And if any one wishes to know how a Roman holds his main beliefs, and how they come to him, and how reasonable he counts them, he could not do better than listen to Monsignor Kolbe. His book has charmed and enlightened us, though it will not do much, we fear, to convince a non-Roman mind. It is well, however, that this particular angle of belief should be expounded, as it is being expounded by so many competent hands, to the 'outsider.'

Among the multitude of books on Jonah a conspicuous place will be taken by the Rev. A. D. Martin's, entitled *The Prophet Jonah: The Book and the Sign* (Longmans; paper covers 3s., cloth 4s. 6d. net). It is not a continuous exposition of the prophecy; rather does it concentrate upon its leading thoughts—for example, its generous outlook, its intolerance of bigotry—and it does so with a distinction of style and an aptness of literary allusion which put it in a class quite by itself, and justify the high commendation which Professor Peake bestows upon it in a prefatory note. Of particular interest is the comparison of Jonah, as a sign, to Coleridge's 'Ancient Mariner,' who was also a sign (to the wedding-guests); and equally interesting is the suggestion that, as a delicate satire upon the contemporary prophetic order and indeed upon post-exilic Israel as a whole, the book may be compared with 'Don Quixote,' which successfully laughed the foolish stories of knight-errantry out of existence. Perhaps the writer is at his best in the suggestive chapter on the Anatomy of Bigotry, and in his persuasive plea for a patriotism which is not blind to the excellences of other nations, blended with an internationalism which is something more than a vague and sloppy cosmopolitanism. Mr. Martin has given a thoroughly fresh and unconventional treatment of the book, which helps to reveal it as one of the masterpieces not only of ancient but of all literature.

America is rich in lectureships. The wealthy business man there seems to take it for granted that some of his superfluous money ought to be devoted to founding a college or at least a course of lectures. The 'Cole Lectures' are an example of this kind of foundation, and one fruit of it is the book by the Rev. S. Parkes Cadman on *Imagination and Religion* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net). It is difficult to say anything about the book except that it is all true and all very eloquent. The subjects dealt with are 'The Power of Imagination,' 'The Wonders of Imagination,' 'The Perils of Imagination,' 'Imagination in Man's Spiritual Growth,' 'Imagination and the Bible,' and 'The Christ of Romance.' The reading list appended to the lectures shows how widely the writer has read, and the lectures reveal evidence of much thought.

Perhaps the lecturer's eloquence leads one to undervalue his other qualities. It is difficult to go on speaking of one subject, especially a subject of this kind, and be very definite. But the lectures are really able and suggestive. The speaker is at his best in the discourse on 'The Christ of Romance,' in which he has much to say of Christ's method of teaching that is wise and helpful.

The ingenious and fertile mind of Dr. Rendel Harris has been at work on *The Early Colonists of the Mediterranean* (Manchester: The University Press; 1s. 6d. net); and in an argument of thirty-four pages he reaches the following conclusions: (i) there is evidence for South Arabian colonization in Egypt, (ii) there is evidence for Egyptian colonization in the Ægean and on the Syrian coast, (iii) there is evidence for Hittite colonies in Libya and in the Mediterranean generally, and Hittite migration may possibly even have reached the Rhine, for the Chatti referred to by the Romans may be none other than Hittites. The evidence for the Arabian colonization of Egypt consists of cowries, and still more of spices; for the Egyptian colonization of the Syrian coast the evidence is paper and papyrus products—notably Byblos, which was in all probability originally an Egyptian settlement or colony; while the migrations of the Hittites can be traced by a succession of salt-works. These fascinating conjectures are illustrated by much curious detail.

Another proof of the versatility of Dr. Harris is his *Rendering in Prose and Verse of the Twenty-Sixth Ode of Solomon* (John Rylands Library, Manchester; printed for private circulation). The verse rendering is naturally pretty free, but it is as fine as it is free. Here are two typical verses:

> Could I once that music reach,
> Once attain that sacred speech,
> Once expound that wondrous Love,
> Gladly then would I remove;
>
> Gladly leave my finished quest,
> Finding once His songs of rest;
> This the fount of life for me,
> This the river, this the sea.

A new translation of the Epistle to the Hebrews has been done by the Rev. F. H. Wales, B.D., and published by the Oxford University Press at the modest price of one shilling net. The title is simply *The Epistle to the Hebrews:* Translation. The preface is a fine example of *multum in parvo.* It would be difficult to find two pages of print into which more facts and information have been packed. The translation is preceded by a brief analysis of the Epistle into seven sections. The rendering itself is scholarly and accurate, with no attempt to be 'modern.' We have tested it and found it not wanting. Here, for example, is the translation of ch. $13^{5f.}$ The reader will see that it is correct at every point (even to the important 'we say' instead of 'we may say'): 'Let your manner of life be not money loving: being content with what ye have: for himself hath said—

> *I will in no wise fail thee,*
> *And I will in no wise forsake thee:*

so that being of good courage we say—

> *The Lord is my helper, I will not be afraid:*
> *What shall man do to me?*

That is even better (and more accurate) than Moffatt.

Preachers, and devout Christians generally, of a former generation, found Matthew Henry's famous commentary on the Bible a source of light and leading. Many Scottish homes of the pious sort possessed a copy and it was read diligently. We can hardly say that its usefulness is exhausted. But one of the urgent needs of to-day is a Matthew Henry suitable for our time, a Matthew Henry brought up to date. If some one with Henry's genius and insight could issue a Commentary, popular and yet scientific, with unction and in few words, he would be a benefactor. Failing this, in one volume, we have the thing done in many volumes by the 'Devotional Commentary,' the latest four volumes of which (up to the 42nd) comprise *1 and 2 Samuel* by the Rev. W. H. Rigg, D.D., Vicar of Beverley Minster; the second volume of the exposition of *Acts* by the Rev. Charles Brown, D.D.; and the *Epistles to the Colossians and to Titus* by the Rev. D. Dawson-Walker, M.A., D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Durham. The expositors of Samuel and Acts follow a similar method. It is very much that of the Expositor's Bible, each chapter consisting of a lecture in which the teaching of a passage is discussed, the exegesis of words and clauses being worked into the discussion. This is a method very useful to preachers,

and on the whole perhaps, dealing with historical books, the most satisfactory. In both the cases before us the method is used by practised hands and with excellent results. Students and teachers, as well as pastors, will find the meaning and message of these books both expounded and applied to our own day with insight and felicity. The Commentary on Colossians and Titus is on different lines. It is on the model of the well-known expository studies of the late Bishop of Durham, Dr. Moule. It is a word-by-word exegesis and running commentary, the words of Scripture being printed in black letters as they occur in the expositor's stride. This method is suitable peculiarly for the Epistles, where so much depends on the exact significance of the individual words. The general standpoint of the series is that of an intelligent orthodoxy, and the expositions are scholarly and devout. The Religious Tract Society is the publishing house, and the extremely small price of each volume is 3s. 6d. net.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge is true to its name in issuing a little book by Canon J. M. Harden, D.D., LL.D., of St. Patrick's, Dublin —*An Introduction to Ethiopic Christian Literature* (5s. net). For, scholars apart, the knowledge of its subject must be limited indeed. Brief sketches of the language, the history of the Ethiopic Church, its Bible, its liturgies and theology, its chronicles and philosophy leave no empty spaces in the crowded hundred pages. The Germans, we are told, tried during the War to wrest the land from its historic Christianity to Muhammadanism, surely one of the ugliest facts even of that distressing time. For the rest, practically all this literature is Christian and anonymous, and the great mass of it translation. The Ethiopic Bible has an odd look to our eyes. For has not its New Testament thirty-five books? And its Old Testament also appears unfamiliar. Dr. Harden reminds us that it is in Ethiopic alone that the whole of the Book of Enoch, and the like, has been discovered. Yet he is modest in his claims. This 'is in some respects a literature,' he says, 'which cannot awaken any feeling of lively interest, for it is to a very great extent devoid of that quality of originality which most of all inspires interest.'

There has been issued by the Student Christian Movement a cheap edition of *Christian Fellowship in Thought and Prayer*, by the Rev. Basil Matthews, M.A., and the Rev. Harry Bisseker, M.A. (2s. net). It was first published towards the end of 1919, and its object, it will be remembered, was to expound a special mode of approach to God—the path of fellowship in thought and prayer, and the principles on which that method rests. Given certain conditions, 'the unanimous judgment attained, whether it cover the whole or only a part of the problem under consideration, may be accepted with confidence as a revelation from God Himself.'

According to some writers, and notably Mr. J. S. Hoyland, M.A., whose 'The Race Problem and the Teaching of Jesus Christ' was reviewed recently in these columns, the present method and spirit in which history is taught are responsible for much of the misunderstanding, hatred, and conflict that torment the world to-day. He has set forth this thesis in his most recent book, *Faith and History* (S.C.M.; 5s. net). But the book contains a great deal more than this thesis. It is a very able and persuasive essay on the meaning of history, and especially on the fact that we can only understand, and therefore teach, history from a definitely religious standpoint. The real barrier against the 'suicide of the human race' is the proper training of the young. This includes a right view of history, not as the story of nationalities which have a pride and an interest to assert and defend, but as the development of a Divine world-purpose, within which each nationality has a contribution to make to the welfare of mankind. And so the teachers must become men of an 'international mind,' and this is possible only from a religious point of view. In supporting this conclusion Mr. Hoyland deals first with the different kinds of history teaching and the meaning of history. He then proceeds to trace this working of the Divine will in the evolution of Nature and of the human race. This leads to a section on the Incarnation and the place of Christ as realizing to the full God's great aim. The rest of the book is an unfolding of this line of thought as it is seen in the course of the world's historical development. And the book concludes with a sketch of a suggested history-course. We have been greatly impressed by the intellectual grasp and vision in this arresting book. It will inspire teachers and preachers, but it is a book that, read by the average citizen, would do much to spread a better attitude to the problems of world politics to-day.

Broadcasting in Old Testament Times.

By the Reverend B. Vernon Bird, Pembury.

Some of the customs met with amongst primitive peoples to-day are undoubtedly survivals from very ancient times, and afford suggestive hints of the explanation of passages in the O.T. One of them is the method adopted by natives of South Africa of sending news by relays of voices from hill to hill, over great distances, called by the British colonials 'Mountain Telegraph.' The natives are very reticent about it; but observant missionaries and traders have ample evidence of its existence; and, during over nine years' ministry at King William's Town, Cape Province, a district having ninety-three thousand native inhabitants, the present writer often heard of it; and once, in the District of Fort Beaufort, witnessed it. I was visiting the beautifully situated little 'town' of Balfour, near to the sources of the Kat River, and the mountain from which it is named, the Kat Berg. It was in May 1915. The Rev. J. W. Jordan, minister of a European Church at Balfour, took me for a walk up one of the spurs of the Kat Berg. It was a brilliant day. At the end of our climb, we stood and viewed a wonderful panorama of mountain valleys bathed in sunshine. The air was clear and still. In that atmosphere it is difficult to realize how far off landmarks are. An object a hundred miles away as clear as it would be in England five miles away in 'good visibility'; and, in the heights, sounds can be heard at great distances. Jordan pointed out and named various bergs and kops and patches of forest. Presently I said, 'Let's listen to the silence.' In a few minutes, hearing a distant sound, as of a man's voice, the rich deep voice of a Kafir, I exclaimed, 'What's that?' We waited, and peered into the distance. Again the voice came. Jordan, whose eyes and ears were more accustomed to the country than mine, pointing away a little to the right, said, 'Do you see that long hill rising to a ridge, and then a *krantz*?' (precipice). 'Now look; just at the top of the *krantz* there is a speck. Wait, you may see it move.' I did; the speck moved a little along the edge of the *krantz*. Again I heard the voice, and it seemed to come from that speck. We waited in silence; and from another direction far away to our left, the other side of the Kat Valley, came another voice of slightly higher pitch. The two voices continued, at short intervals, for some minutes and ceased; and the speck, which was a Kafir, disappeared. Jordan said, 'It's the mountain telegraph.'

Pictures from the O.T. poetical language came to my mind: 'Look, upon the mountains the feet of him that bears tidings, that proclaims "Peace"' (Nah 1^{15}). 'How beautiful upon the mountains the feet of him that bears tidings, proclaiming "Peace"; bearing tidings of good: proclaiming "Deliverance"; saying to Zion: "Thy God reigns"' (Is 52^{7}). On the hills around the 'waste places of Jerusalem,' the desolation that was once a city, are, poetically conceived, watchmen waiting day and night. They hear the news, and feel the thrill of it. 'The voice of thy watchmen. They lift up the voice, together do they sing.' To some who hear, it is too good to be true, or they too deep in despair to credit it—'Who hath believed what we have heard?' (53^{1}). Then again, Is 40^{3}: 'A voice calling: "In the wilderness, prepare the way of Yahweh."'

In 1915 the South African Government was recruiting native labour for the expedition to German South-West Africa. A sturdy tribe of 'raw' Kafirs, the Imidushane, held a great Indaba at Tamara, District of King William's Town. Their chief, Menziwa, a heathen (though the word is objectionable), made a speech to his loyal tribe telling them of the Government's project of railway extension at Prieska, and said, 'We are told that we are wanted to make paths for the iron horse, flatten the hills, bridge the rivers, straighten crooked paths, fill up the holes.' Almost as if he had read Is 40^{4}.

The call by mountain telegraph for preparation of the way for a royal traveller occurs several times in the O.T., *e.g.* 'Cast up, cast up, prepare the way' (Is 57^{14}). In 62^{10} the call seems to be broadcast: 'Go through, go through the gates; prepare the way of the people; cast up, cast up the highway; gather out the stones; lift up an ensign for the peoples. See, Yahweh has proclaimed unto the end of the earth, "Say ye to the daughter of Zion, Look, deliverance has come."'

To return to Is 40. A voice says, 'Call out.' Another voice answers from the distance, of one who despairs of calling to a people hopeless and apathetic: 'What shall I call? All flesh is grass, and all its loveliness as the flower of the field: the grass withers, the flower fades: because the breath of Yahweh blows upon it; surely the people is grass.' The herald answers back: 'The grass withers, the flower fades: but the word of our God will stand for ever.' The answer gives hope to the desperate, and he calls back the summons: 'Get thee up into a high mountain, bearer of tidings to Zion; lift up with strength thy voice, bearer of tidings to Jerusalem.' In spite of the feminine participle in Heb. and in view of the masculine participle in LXX of this verse and in Heb. of 41^{27}, 'I will give to Jerusalem a bearer of tidings,' the R.V. version is to be preferred. The 'mountain telegraph' throws light upon Is $21^{6.7}$, where the watchman is to look and report what he sees, but also to 'listen diligently with great attention.' And 21^{11}, 'One calls unto me from Seir, Watchman, what of the night?' See also Hab 2^{1}.

When news was received, it speedily passed from mouth to mouth. In the song of Deborah we read how news was passed by travellers riding over the country, just as it does to-day amongst the Kafirs; people sitting in their houses; friends meeting on the road; or at the well as they go to draw water (Jg $5^{10.11}$). The fateful news of the death of Saul was carried by messengers 'sent into the land of the Philistines round about, to carry the tidings unto the house of their idols and to the people' (1 S 31^{9}). Just as David feared: 'Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Ashkelon; lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph.' Women were wont to take up news and carry it about (Ps 68^{11}): 'The women that publish the tidings are a great host,' or (see Briggs, *in loc.*) 'The women are heralding war.' News coming across the mountains is pictured in Ps 72^{3}: 'The mountains are personified for the messengers who come over them, proclaiming from all parts the prevalence of peace and righteousness' (Briggs). See also Jer 4^{15-16} 31^{6}, Ezk 7^{7} 19^{9}. The custom that still prevails in South Africa may, for all the present writer knows, be found in many other lands where the air is clear enough for the voice to carry over long distances; as, in Britain in early times, beacon fires carried warnings over the land from hill to hill.

Recent Excavations in Mesopotamia, 1918–1926.

By S. Langdon, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Assyriology in the University of Oxford, and Director of the Oxford and Field Museum Expedition at Kish.

The occupation of the historic lands of Babylonia and Assyria by the British Army was one of the few beneficent results of the Great War. The opportunity afforded by the transfer of Mesopotamia from Turkey to Great Britain was at once utilized by the British Museum in 1918, and the War Office directed Dr. Campbell Thompson to explore the region of Nasiriyah, at once, before hostilities had ceased. The two principal sites in this area are Ur and Eridu, the former being the ancient Sumerian city of the Moon-god *Sin* or *Nannar*, and the latter the equally ancient seat of the cult of the Sumerian Water-god and patron of philosophy, *Ea* (the Ôannēs of the Greek writers on Babylonia) or *Enki*. In the autumn of 1918, Dr. H. R. Hall of the British Museum received a similar commission for the same sites; both were only temporary and tentative explorations of this important area, and of their results I first give account.

Brief mention should be made of the *Excursion archéologique en Mesopotamie*, by Le Comte Aymar de Liedekerke-Beaufort, a valiant soldier who fell at Verdun in 1916. His explorations at Ur and Eridu in 1913–14 are recorded from notes left in the hands of Charles Virolleaud, and are published in *Babyloniaca*, Paris, 1923, vol. vii. pp. 105–116. He gave a detailed geographical account of the country along the Euphrates from above Babylon to the famous Muhammadan city Nedjef, and from Nedjef to Muqayyar (Ur) and Abu Shahrain (Eridu), where the Euphrates reached the sea in ancient times. He remarks on Ur and Eridu that the ruins of their

stage towers are remarkably well preserved. At Ur he found natives digging for and finding cuneiform tablets. Four miles south of Ur, beyond a low sand ridge, lies the wide desolate basin known as Solébié, in the midst of which rise the ruins of the famous city Eridu. He gives a vivid account of the Arab tribes of this area, and especially of the powerful Muntefiks, who are said to have come from Mecca and whose sheikh founded Nasiriyah, the most important city in this region at the junction of the Euphrates and the old Sumerian canal, which joins the Tigris and Euphrates, now the Shatt el Hai. A good description of Eridu is given by this intrepid traveller, and also of the Roman fortress Qasr el Gesayem at the extreme southern side of the great basin on the edge of the Arabian desert. It is regrettable that this cultured Frenchman passed away in the full vigour of youth, before the great revival of Mesopotamian excavations initiated by British scholars after the War.

Eridu, the scene of Thompson's principal excavations, like Ur, its neighbouring city, fourteen miles to the north, is a foundation of prehistoric times, and though never the seat of a ruling dynasty, it, with Nippur in central Sumer, was one of the two great centres of Sumerian theology, and its Water-god counted as the third member of the Sumerian trinity: *Anu*, the Heaven-god of Erech, *Enlil*, the Earth-god of Nippur, and *Ea*, the Water-god of Eridu. It is not surprising, therefore, that sherds of pottery in black and red painted designs were found both on the surface and in trenches here. Thompson and Hall established the existence of an early Sumerian period of painted ware (*c.* 3500 B.C.) in Babylonia for the first time, and the fact was further confirmed by Hall at Ur and the neighbouring site, Tal-al-'Ubaid. In fact, the discovery of fine painted ware is one of the most remarkable features of recent excavations in Mesopotamia. It was to be followed by a great discovery of complete vessels of this ware at Jemdet Nasr in 1925–26 by the Oxford and Field Museum Expedition, and at 'Ubaid by the British Museum and Philadelphia Expedition in 1923–24. We now know that, before the real political history of the Sumerians begins (*c.* 3000 B.C.), they had long been master-craftsmen in the ceramic art in the entire region of their early occupation from Assyria in the north to the Persian Gulf. For some unknown reason this great art passed away and the skill of the sculptor takes its place in the period of their best culture (3000–2000 B.C.). At Eridu the city wall is of limestone, a unique feature of Babylonian archæology; for stone is rare in the valley of the two rivers. The ruins of its stage tower in the northern end of the city rises above the line of the wall to a height of eighty feet, and was known to the Sumerians as *E-unir*, 'the building of admiration.' At Ur the stage tower *E-lugalmalgasidi*, 'building of the king who directs justice,' also stands on the northern side of the city. Every great temple of Babylonia and Assyria had its stage tower, and at Kish there are still two of them standing as they were left by the early Sumerian masons, who employed small biscuit-shaped bricks. Wind and rain and spoliation by natives in search of bricks for building houses have destroyed the upper stages of every stage tower in the land. Only the bottom stage, and in some cases, as at Ur, Barsippa, and Kish, remnants of the second, and less often the third, stage remain. In early times they consisted of four stages only, and of this type were the towers of Eridu and Ur.

Thompson noted the marble staircase of the tower of Eridu on the S.E. side previously found by Taylor (1854) and exposed a portion of this face. This staircase is built at right angles with the S.E. face of the *ziggurat*, as is the central stairway of the N.E. side of the *ziggurat* at Ur. He sank pits in every part of the mound to determine the stratification and proved its very great age, and that the place ceased to be of any importance after the time of Hammurabi (twenty-first century B.C.). No plan of the stage tower and temple (Esira) of Ea has yet been made. Hall made careful excavations of Sumerian houses in the residential quarter and found their walls faced with white plaster, and sometimes painted with red and white stripes three inches broad. A great deal of attention is given by both excavators to the types of pottery at Eridu. Thompson visited several mounds east of Eridu, namely, Murajib, Tuwaiyil, and El-Lahm, and established their great age by pottery sherds from these sites. The ancient names of none of these ruins could be determined.

The best discovery of these preliminary expeditions was made by Hall at a small mound four miles west of Ur, where a fine early temple of Ninhursag, goddess of child-birth, was unexpectedly found. His work was latterly completed by Mr. C. L. Woolley. This is the first large building of plano-convex brick masonry excavated in Mesopotamia,

although in the season of 1923–24 Mr. Mackay and Colonel Lane discovered a larger and finer one at Kish. The 'Ubaid temple was rebuilt by Dungi, king of Ur (2391–2344 B.C.). So far as we now know, the great city of Ur possessed no temple to the great earth-mother goddess, and it is possible that this site nearby was chosen for her temple and cult. Here was found the oldest known historical inscription (*c.* 3100 B.C.) of *A-an-ni-pad-da*, second king of the first dynasty of Ur, and a torso of an early Sumerian statue of a certain Kurlil of Erech. On the south-east side of this temple, near a stone stairway, Hall and Woolley discovered a great horde of copper objects, revealing the astonishing skill of Sumerian metal workers. From Hall's work comes the remarkable large copper imitation of the well-known heraldic emblem of various Sumerian cities, a lion-headed eagle grasping with its talons two fine stags in deep relief, their heads and spreading antlers being attached free from the monument. Friezes of copper bulls and others of beautiful white limestone and shell inlay, representing agricultural scenes, lay in fragments at the entrance of the temple. We found similar inlay work both outside of and inside the old Sumerian palace of Kish. This fine inlay work of 'Ubaid and Kish is clearly from the same period and the same school of craftsmanship. Here again, as in the case of the ancient painted ware, we have a delicate success in art, which suddenly disappears for ever in the long history of peoples. It is precisely this inexplicable and disturbing feature of human history that makes excavation and archæology an invaluable branch of modern science.

Near the temple to the south was found an old Sumerian residential quarter abandoned for a cemetery at an early period. Here were implements of the Neolithic period, clay sickles (set with flint teeth at Kish), stone corn grinders, and much painted and incised pottery. The bodies were wrapped in reed mats and laid in the earth without other covering, a custom characteristic of the early period. Later burials of the classical Sumerian period are frequently narrow brick tombs in which the bath-shaped clay coffins are placed. These tomb burials were also found at Ur. The new element in archæology here is that the burials in clay coffins appear to be as early as the twenty-fifth century.

In 1922 begins the period of more consecutive excavations by fully equipped and financed expeditions. Both are joint organizations, British and American. The British Museum and the University Museum of Philadelphia sent out Mr. C. L. Woolley with a staff to continue the work at Ur; Oxford University (with the support of Mr. Herbert Weld, Hon. D.Litt., Hon. Fellow of Queen's College) and the Field Museum of Chicago sent out Mr. Ernest Mackay to excavate the ancient city of Kish, eight miles east of Babylon. Both expeditions have worked continuously for the past four seasons and both have again returned for a fifth season (1926–27).

Ur is a large oval mound with long axis north-south (160 rods), and short axis east-west (120 rods). The sacred area, on which stood the massive stage tower and temples of the Moon-god (Sin) and his consort (Ningal), as well as the palace of the kings of Ur (Ehursag), the convent, temple library, and court of justice, together with other buildings connected with the temple service, lies in the north-western section. Its enclosing double wall, traced by Hall and Woolley, contains chambers communicating with the platform on which stood this enormous complex of buildings. This is known as the *temenos* area in all Sumerian, Babylonian, and Assyrian cities. It is an immense walled rectangle, 823 feet on the N.W. end, 650 feet on the S.E. end, 1312 feet on the S.W. side, and 1246 feet on the N.E. side. On the N.W. corner of this area is another higher terrace and enclosing wall, on which stand the stage tower, the temple of Ningal, wife of the Moon-god, just south of the tower, and temple service buildings to the north of the tower. At each west and north corner of the *ziggurat* or tower platform are heavily walled fortresses, and the plan of defence is completed at the south and east corners by great buildings, the temple of Ningal and the heavy walls of the shrine Edublalmah. The entire *temenos* wall is named Etemennigur, but Mr. Woolley believes that this name applies to the great terrace wall of the *ziggurat* platform.

Dr. Hall cleared the S.E. side of the great tower in 1918–19 and determined the dimensions of the lower stage, which, like all Sumerian stage towers, is orientated with its corners to the cardinal points, and so is the sacred *temenos* area and the tower terrace. The stages of these towers are usually square, but Elugal-malgasidi at Ur is rectangular, 130 by 190 feet, the long sides being N.E. and S.W., agreeing in plan with the *temenos* area. We also found the ground plan of the tower of the War-god's temple at Kish slightly rectangular, 185 by 198 feet. On the N.E. side three long stairways, steps in stone

with brick ramps, lead up from the terrace to the platform of the second stage ; two of them are built parallel with the N.E. face of the lower stage from the north and east ends, and the central stair is at right angles with the face as at Eridu, and probably at Kish. This construction, as it stands, is largely the work of the great kings of Ur in the twenty-fourth century, but it has been repaired by Nebuchadnezzar and Nabunidus in the sixth century. The tower has only four stages, and if deductions can be made from quantities of blue glazed bricks of Nabunidus, the top stage is really a shrine (*shahuru*), built as a sleeping chamber for the god and goddess of Ur. The face of the bottom stage is covered with a coating of black bitumen. East of the tower is a great sunken court surrounded by chambers : its N.W. wall is faced with panels and attached pillars, and its whole face is whitewashed.

The great shrine of the Moon-god (Sin) and his consort Ningal, known as the temple Nunmah, 'house of the far-famed prince,' was found on the *temenos* platform below the east corner of the *ziggurat* platform. Its two chapels for the god and goddess are in good state of preservation, and many of its service chambers could be planned by Woolley. The temple had been completely reconstructed by Nebuchadnezzar, who razed many chambers before the shrines of the N.W. side, and laid down a walled court, obviously for liturgical and processional services. The brick pedestals for the statues of god and goddess were found at the back of their chambers. Reparations by Cyrus, the Mede, were also in evidence here. The pavement of a side chapel is laid in mosaics of white shell on bitumen, and beneath a pavement of Cyrus lay a horde of fine jewellery and precious stones.

Special mention must be made of two buildings where discoveries of the utmost importance were made, namely, the temple of Ningal on the tower terrace and the great rectangular building on the *temenos* platform just S.E. of the terrace, known as *Egepar*, the convent, with its magnificent shrine Edublalmah at the north end. This special temple of Ningal, whose cult in this temple is distinguished from her cult in Enunmah (as the consort of Sin), apparently represents the cult of the great virgin goddess Ishtar or Innini, the Sumerian Venus. It had been completely remodelled by Nabunidus. The fore-hall and inner shrine, the side chapels and the great adjacent court of this royal builder were first planned, and then removed. Below this lies the fine original building of the kings of Ur. In the court of *Egepar* lay the fragments of a magnificent stone stela, sculptured in bas-relief on both sides. It is the work of Ur-Nammu, founder of the last Sumerian dynasty of Ur (2409–2390 B.C.). In various registers he is represented standing before his god and goddess, Sin and Ningal, and pouring water into a great pot in which stands a small tree. The god holds an adze, measuring rod, and coiled line with which Mr. Woolley compares the vision of Ezekiel, when he received plans from his God concerning the new temple in Jerusalem. The stela actually represents Ur-Nammu proceeding to build a temple ; he carries a pick, basket, trowel, and mason's implements, and follows his god to his work. In another remarkable register of this stela a winged angel is seen descending from heaven toward Ur-Nammu. The angel pours water (?) from a bowl, which descends in a stream to a vase (?), held in the outstretched hands of Ur-Nammu. Gudea, governor of Lagash of the twenty-sixth century, tells of a similar vision which he received from his gods concerning the building of the temple E-ninnû to his god Ningirsu, and this has already been compared to the vision of Ezekiel by the Hebrew scholar, the late Dr. G. B. Gray. The stela, sadly incomplete, has also a liturgical scene on which two musicians beat a great drum (*balag*), a scene previously found at Lagash. On the S.E. side of Ningal's temple runs a fine paved street leading up to a gate house on the east corner of the terrace platform, by which one enters the court of the massive shrine Edublalmah and the convent Egepar. South of this street opposite the Ningal temple was found Ehursag, the palace of the kings of Ur. Here, beneath the late pavement, the excavators came upon three brick boxes containing small clay statuettes of priests. Their priestly robes are imitations of a huge fish, symbol of the water god Ea, deity of purification, who cleanses from all sin. A bronze relief, long since known in Paris, represents two priests wearing this robe, and they actually stand at the head and foot of a patient in the act of driving out the seven devils. Such is the ancient heritage of priestly magic, which still survives in dissembled form, ever a powerful appeal to the religious imagination of man through the ages, the priest commissioned by divine ordination wears the symbol of his mystic warrant to purge mankind from his sins.

The massive shrine Edublalmah is called in the inscriptions found there 'the place of (Nannar's)

judgements,' and has been described by the excavator as the 'Hall of Justice.' Many other cities had also their Duplalmah, and from hordes of tablets found in adjacent rooms of this building, together with the natural meaning of the name 'far-famed house filled with tablets,' it is certain that the place was a kind of college and administrative building. The name of the entire building, including the massive shrine and forehall with court, is *Egepar*, known to have been a convent, where the high priestess resided. No less a personage than Nabunidus, king of Babylonia, caused his daughter to enter as high priestess of Nannar, the Moon-god, here. In the older building of the kings of Ur, two vaulted doorways looked out from the wings of the sanctuary, and show remarkable skill in the construction of the arch. Lane also found at Kish, in a very ancient Sumerian palace, a long vaulted drain, and in the palace of the kings of Kish was a vaulted kiln or oven.

A fine marble head of a woman of the best period of Sumerian art was recovered in Ehursag (?); the delineation of the features is not surpassed by anything in Greek sculpture, and is comparable to the wonderful statuette of a Sumerian woman (twenty-sixth century) found at Lagash. Both wear the same broad-brimmed turban with hair rolled in large chignons. This was erroneously taken for the head of the goddess Ningal, but of course it cannot represent a goddess who would wear the horned tiara. In 1925–26 the excavation of the Ningal temple was completed, and religious and grammatical texts were found, together with a horde of jewellery and a fine alabaster stone, carved with a boating scene. Special mention should be made of the temple kitchen, whose oven, sinks, and stone hand-mills were found in remarkable preservation, such that Mr. Woolley was able to restart the fires and make a photograph of the kitchen staff preparing a dinner and drawing water from the kitchen well. From this building comes a good stone statuette of a seated woman handsomely dressed in the style of the classical Sumerian period; a spacious and elegant flounced cloak falls over the body to the feet, and she wears a close-fitting necklace of several strands. It is precisely of the same style as the bas-relief figure of a Sumerian lady on a stone basin of Lagash. Remarkable is the sculpture of a goose on the side of her low stool. This, again, is erroneously defined as a figure of a goddess, and described as the goddess Bau.

It will be seen from this fragmentary review of the excavations at Ur, that this expedition has done a careful and valuable piece of work in exposing the temple plan of one of the greatest religious cults of antiquity. We now have before us very definite knowledge about the complicated temple constructions of the cult of the Moon-god of Babylonia, where the kings of the last powerful Sumerian dynasty ruled for a century over the destinies of Western Asia, and spread their culture to the far lands of Assyria, Cappadocia, and Syria.

Of the four seasons of the Oxford and Field Museum Expedition at Kish I can write with more personal touch, as I was interested in this undertaking from the time when Dr. Herbert Weld first made his offer to promote excavations in Mesopotamia. This cultured patron of learning, himself an admirable Orientalist, travelled in Mesopotamia in the spring of 1922, visiting various sites and endeavouring to secure for Oxford the most valuable inscriptions found by the natives. Among the treasures which he secured is the now famous Weld Prism of the Ashmolean Museum, which is a compilation of all the Sumerian and Semitic dynasties by a scribe who lived at the end of the dynasty of Isin. Beginning with mythological names of the ten kings who lived before the Flood, the scribe brings his lists of kings down to the end of the reign of Sin-magir (2098 B.C.). This and another tablet secured by him gave us at last the names of the ten antediluvian kings corresponding to the ten antediluvian patriarchs of Hebrew tradition, and confirmed, what was already known from Berossus, the Sumerian origin of the Hebrew tradition; it assigns a period of 456,000 years to the antediluvian period, and the Hebrew reduction of this period to about 1500 years is inexplicable, showing little knowledge of the great antiquity of man and of the remote period of the origins of civilization as now revealed by the excavation of Kish. Historical traditions agree in making Kish the seat of the first kings after the Flood, and it remained the principal capital of northern Sumer until Sargon of Agade (2752 B.C.), after which it continued to be a great metropolis down to the Persian period. It is of far greater antiquity than its later rival Babylon, eight miles away, on the new course of the Euphrates. We found the ruins of Kish to consist of mounds scattered over an area nearly five miles long from west to east. The old course of the Euphrates passed through it

dividing the city into eastern and western Kish. The occupations of both sides of the river are equally ancient, but the earliest Sumerian buildings are much better preserved in the more extensive eastern area.

The eastern ruins are now known by the Arabs as Ingharra, and the western ruins as Tal-al-Uhaimir; the former lies a mile south-east of the latter, but there is another great mound at the eastern end beyond Ingharra, named Abu Sudairah; the buildings in this mound have not been determined. Beneath the many huge and smaller mounds of Ingharra lie the principal temple of the great mother-goddess of the Sumerians, Ninhursag, the ancient palace of the powerful kings of Kish, and many other unidentified temples of various deities. The huge ruins at Uhaimir cover the temple of the War-god of the Sumerians, Emeteursag, where the War-goddess Ishtar also had a chapel and cult.

Mr. Mackay began excavations at Emeteursag in 1922, and excavated the south-eastern side of the *temenos* platform, and exposed the south-eastern and south-western sides of the stage tower. Only the lowest base of this tower can now be traced, but there are remnants of two or more superior stages and it is still in comparatively good state of preservation. As at Ur the *temenos* walls contain rooms, communicating with the platform, on which stand the *ziggurat* and temple. A corridor runs round the base of the tower, communicating with court chambers, but its communications with the large temple on the north-east side have not been determined. Stamped bricks of the principal Babylonian restorers of the tower and temple, Samsu-iluna, Adad-apal-iddin, and Nebuchadnezzar abound, and the additions which they made to the facings of the walls and to the platforms are perfectly dated by them. The early plano-convex levels were reached in deep trial trenches and some painted pottery was recovered. Fragments of a large diorite stela of Hammurabi have been found in the clearings in almost every part of the mound; the fragments recovered are all inscribed in Sumerian, but nothing can now be pieced together to discover the contents of the text. Considerable work was done that season on the extensive residential quarter of western Kish, where a few cuneiform tablets, pottery of the age of Samsu-iluna, and copper weapons of the same period, were found. The best object recovered here is a perfect bone stylus, the only example now known of the instrument employed for writing the cuneiform script. A discovery made early in the second season by Colonel W. H. Lane, who had joined Mr. Mackay in October 1923, altered the plans of our excavations, and the scene of activity was shifted to eastern Kish, to which we have devoted our principal resources for the following three years. Two plano-convex buildings were detected in low unattractive mounds; one near the Ninhursag temple area, and one in the open plain almost a mile to the north, but evidently inside the old city walls. The original palace of the early kings of Kish appears to have been the great building which Mackay and Lane excavated near the temple and stage tower in eastern Kish. Two full seasons were spent on this site, and a complete plan of it has been made. Its principal feature consists in a spacious open court on the south-west corner, bounded on the eastern side by a fine alcoved wall, which is broken by a wide flight of brick steps at the back of a series of receding buttresses. This wall is the western face of a wing of the palace, and the steps lead up to the level of the rooms from the court. In the débris behind this wall lay fragments of a fine slate plaque, inlaid with white limestone figures, showing the king of Kish bringing captured kings to his city. The northern side of the court is a straight-faced wall, before which runs a heavy sleeper wall mounted by heavy round brick pillars. The discovery of this wall of pillars was a revelation in early Sumerian architecture. The plan is somewhat similar to that of the sunken court found at Ur of a much later period. The panelled whitewashed wall, decorated with attached pillars on the north-west end of the court, has been mentioned above. Parallel to this wall, but at a much greater distance away than stands the pillared wall of Kish from the face of the palace, runs a low wall on which Woolley believes wooden pillars to have been set. But the supposed pillared wall of Ur is only a conjecture, though a probable one, whereas the pillared wall of Kish was actually found in good repair, and its great antiquity is indisputable. Photographs of the fine palace court have been repeatedly published in the press and in the writer's *Excavations at Kish*, plates ix.–xii., where the evidence can be plainly seen. In a chamber behind this court wall lay fragments of another slate frieze, inlaid with white limestone figures of sheep, goats, and milking scenes of the same excellent technique as the inlaid frieze of

Tal-al-ʿUbaid. When Mr. Mackay completed the excavation of this large building in 1924–25 it was found to consist of two groups, which do not communicate with each other. One is characterized by a long hall through the long axis of which runs another wall of pillars; at one end of this wall a large bitumen-lined basin is let into the pavement, apparently for the purpose of washing feet before entering the royal chambers. Characteristic of the adjoining rectangular complex of chambers is a spacious court with doors communicating with rooms on every side. To our great disappointment the sculptures and inscriptions, which were undoubtedly stored here, have been totally despoiled by the conquerors of Kish. The place was abandoned for a cemetery already in early Sumerian times, and from these graves come the best archæological discoveries made there, throwing a great light upon ancient Sumerian beliefs and customs. Buried with the dead were entirely new types of jars and dishes, as yet unique in the history of pottery. The tall water-jars have wide imitation handles on which is depicted the bust of the great goddess Ninhursag of the neighbouring temple. It is a mute symbol of their trust in the mother-goddess, who ever prayed for man before the gods, and signifies their last hope in her intervention for the soul of man, when he should at last stand before the gods of the lower world to receive judgment at the hands of the terrible god of *Arallû*. Copper vanity cases lay beside the bodies of women, together with their beads and copper hair-pins mounted in lapis lazuli; copper weapons of men who had warred on behalf of Kish were found in abundance in their graves.

The writer was present during the season of 1923–24 and devoted himself to excavating a large mound in eastern Kish, one of the residential quarters from the twenty-second century to the age of Nebuchadnezzar. A large number of streets and houses were exposed, and many hundreds of tablets, chiefly grammatical and contracts, were recovered. The tablets are sadly broken but often valuable. One of them contains observations of the risings and settings of Venus for the first six years of the reign of Ammizaduga, king of Babylonia (1921–1901 B.C.). In the third season my work at this site was taken over by Father Burrows, S.J., whose discoveries consist in the same kind of material. A beautiful silver statuette found by him outside a clay coffin shows for the first time a Babylonian lady dressed in the ornate fashion which obtained in the age of Nebuchadnezzar.

In 1925–26 I again rejoined Mr. Mackay, who now turned his whole attention to the vast temple complex of Hursagkalama, which has two stage towers, built in the old Sumerian period of plano-convex bricks, and never repaired by any later ruler. This is strange indeed; for these towers of unbaked bricks must have been in ruins when Sargon of Agade rebuilt an unidentified temple at the north-west side of the larger tower. The north-west side and part of the south-west side of the larger *ziggurat* were exposed. Its huge dimensions are surprising, its base being almost as large as the tower of Babylon. The temple Hursagkalama was located, and the fine restoration by Nabunidus about half exposed. Its uncovered walls faced with false columns and T-shaped recesses now look down upon the desolated plain from their ancient hill and can be seen for miles by the approaching visitor. Beneath this late building lies the older Sumerian temple so frequently mentioned in the liturgies of Babylonian temples. As we cleared the débris between the north-west face of the tower and the south-west face of the older temple, whose identity remains unknown, a good headless statuette of a priest or official of the old Sargonic period was found; it bears a cartouche of a Semite *Ali-ilum* son of *Sarrinna*, who dedicated it to a deity of Kish. The clearance of both this temple and of Hursagkalama will be the task of the coming season. After the well-preserved building of Nabunidus shall have been exposed and planned, it must be removed and the underlying ancient temple dug out.

My own work of the last season was almost exclusively confined to the excavation of a small site seventeen miles north-east of Kish in an indescribably desolate region. No report with plans and photographs of this remarkable site has been made, but I shall briefly describe the salient results. Attention was drawn to this place in 1924, when Arabs brought into our camp complete examples of black and red painted pots as well as clay tablets inscribed in pictographic Sumerian writing. Even the small collection of painted ware, obtained in this way by Mackay, constituted the first important group of such pottery ever recovered in Mesopotamia. I at once obtained concession of this place from the Government and excavated the site in 1925–26. The mound is called *Jemdet Nasr* by the Arabs, and is

a small L-shaped ruin only ten feet above plain level at the highest point, sloping gradually away into the surrounding detritus of the plain. The place is called *Shu-nun-(ki)* on the tablets, and perished in fire at a period more remote than all historical memories of the Sumerian scribes. Here it lay in its ashes and wind-swept débris throughout the ages. Consequently the remnants of the oldest civilization of the valley lay undisturbed by later builders. Only one large building, apparently a palace, stood here; the remainder of the town consists of ruined houses. I cleared this building completely and found a great quantity of painted ware, some of which is in perfect condition. The designs are almost exclusively conventional and geometrical in design, bands, checquer patterns, and diamond figures predominating. A vase in the shape of a pig, the domestic animal most characteristic of early Sumerian life, was a revelation to us; it had been supposed that theriomorphic vases were unknown in Mesopotamia! In one room one hundred and fifty good clay tablets lay in a tumbled mass on the pavement. They are the oldest known documents written on clay tablets, and I was astonished to find that not a single name of a deity occurs here. We had reached that remote age before the religious genius of man had clearly defined the Divine powers which he worshipped. And this is all the more astounding when on tablets, not more than three hundred centuries later from Shuruppak in the far south, we find the names of over eight hundred gods, a good part of the vast Sumerian pantheon. Seals of the most primitive type, copper fish-hooks and flint implements of the Neolithic period abound here. The most remarkable objects I found in a ruined house; they are beautiful and delicate miniature imitations of the larger painted vessels, and are obviously designed as works of art and not for utilitarian purposes.

Although this is the oldest site hitherto excavated, there is one feature which came as a complete surprise to archæologists. The bricks used here are flat and rectangular, and not plano-convex as we should expect by all the canons of Mesopotamian archæology. They measure seven and three-quarters by four inches, and are two and one-fifth inches thick. The baked bricks have two cleanly cut holes at the centre which run straight through the bricks. This is a new factor in the history of brick-making, and it must be assumed that the first workers of this craft used a mould.

Only a half mile away to the south of Jemdet Nasr lie colossal ruins, named Barguthiyat by the Arabs.[1] I planned this site and found there a large marble slab three feet square and four inches thick inscribed with the words, 'Palace of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon.' All the surface débris indicate the period of this king, but excavations may prove it to be ancient. It has no stage tower apparently, but its five lofty mounds surely indicate an immense city whose identity cannot even be suggested. It is difficult to convey any idea of the awful desolation of this land, which is covered with the ruins of cities and strewn for miles in the open plains with pottery sherds from rural habitations.

Besides the work done by the two expeditions at Kish and Ur, there is little to relate. An American School of Archæology has been founded at Baghdad, equipped with the library of the late Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., of Philadelphia. It has an annual director but no building, and the library is not accessible. Three directors have occupied this post in succession, the late Professor Clay of Yale University, Professor E. Chiera of Philadelphia, and Professor Dougherty now at Yale. Dr. Chiera did some work at Kerkuk east of Assur below the Lower Zab river, where he is said to have recovered a great number of contract tablets containing local Mitanni names. The natives of those parts have been selling tablets of this kind for many years, and they are valuable, on account of the information which can be obtained from the personal names, concerning the almost unknown language of the Mitanni people. The American School has planned an archæological survey of the whole of Mesopotamia which should be useful. Of the work done by French excavators at Susa since the War it is not possible to write here; for this site lies outside the scope of this review. A few reports of the work there, carrying on the successful excavations of the late M. de Morgan, are accessible in the *Revue d'Assyriologie*. Painted ware of the early period has again been recovered at Susa, but no other outstanding monuments have come to my notice.

[1] Mr. Henry Field took several photographs of all the mounds in this area.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The White Line.[1]

'I will run the way of thy commandments.'—Ps 119[32].

Down in the cities where there is a rush and jostle of traffic and such a crush, with motors flying this way, and motors flying that way, and motors rushing every way, at some dangerous corners where there is like to be a smash, they have thought out something to prevent accidents, have painted a white line in the centre of the streets; and they tell every one in cars, 'Now you mustn't come swinging round this corner any way; you must keep to your own side of this line; motors going this way to this side, and motors going that way to that side. And if you won't, if you come barging round on the wrong side, there's going to be questions asked and quite a lot of trouble. You didn't notice? Are you blind? The line is painted white so that you can't help seeing it. You meant no harm? You have driven for years and years and never had an accident? Perhaps. But some day, if you rush about like that all over the road, you'll have one, and a bad one, too. Anyhow, you've to keep to your own side.' And if the driver in the motor plays the game, and says, 'All right! I'll be careful about it after this, and keep to my own proper side of the white line,' that's what it means to run in the way of the commandments.

You and I haven't got a car—worse luck!—and yet it's difficult, isn't it, for us too to get about without running into some one, to put in a long, wet Saturday afternoon without a quarrel with somebody, to live day after day at school and not fall out with some chap or other? For he wants this, and you want that; or perhaps you both want the same thing and both can't have it. And we're in such a hurry, and keep cutting in before the others, and it's difficult not to go crashing into something as we come rushing round some corner. And God knows it is difficult. You mustn't go flying about like that, He says, or there's sure to be bad trouble some day. Look, here is a white line, plain to see, that I have had painted in the centre of the street; keep to your own side of it, always run in the way of the commandments, and things will be all right.

If we do, there will be plenty of room for us on our own side. We won't be cramped or crushed one little bit. Yet isn't it funny how we always want to do the things we aren't allowed to do? Often you can see cows and horses in a great, big field of green, fresh grass; and yet, with all that to eat, they are stretching their necks over the barbed wire of the fences, straining to reach something that isn't half as good as what they have in plenty. It's the hedge being there that sets them longing for it. And you do feel an itch and longing to sit up at nights. Why? Just because you aren't allowed to do it. That's why. For we're apt to think that the things we can't do are the jolliest; that to be good is to be dull and prosy, and a bit of a muff; that it's the fellows who disobey and don't care who have all the fun and the adventure; that the other side of the white line looks far more exciting. That's all nonsense. A fine story-teller died the other year, and she said, 'If I could write my books all over again, I would correct a silly mistake that I've been making. I've written as if the selfish people were the big and brave and manly people; and they are not, but just babies who can't play the game, and stand up to their temptations and go straight. It's the good folk who have all the fun and the exciting things in life, and they are the real heroes, not the other mugs.' There's plenty room and heaps of interesting things upon the proper side of the white line. It is from the windows on that side of the train that you have by far the prettiest view.

Anyway, we've got to keep on that side, or else there'll be trouble—not to-day perhaps, and not to-morrow maybe; but some time there will be an awful spill. You may slack to-night and yet get off at school to-morrow wonderfully well; you may creep through quite a lot of times, but some day there will come a test, or an exam, or an inspector, and there'll be a hideous smash, as sure as anything. You may be greedy and grabby and it won't seem to matter very much; for it is only about little things. But some day there'll be a bigger thing, and it will tell then. Some one will be wanted to play in the big match. You? 'Oh,

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

no,' they'll say, 'he's no use, he's so selfish; he never passes, he wants to do everything on his own, and to have the whole credit for himself; he is no good at all.' Or, 'What's the good of playing him? He doesn't hit out for a win, thinks only of his wretched average, and won't take any risks for the side's sake.' And you will be left out—too selfish.

And some day God will want upon His side some one on whom He can depend. What about you? No, you won't do at all! I knew a Colonel at the War who was ever so chummy with his young officers; yet all the time he was taking note of them, and watching them, and he knew them better by far than they ever realized. Some one would be chosen for some big adventure. 'Why didn't you give it to So-and-so?' I would ask. 'No,' he would say, 'he wouldn't do. I saw him once get into a tight place in a game of cards, and he got flustered and lost his head. Flustered at cards means flustered in a big thing too.' Or, 'I have seen him chaffed, and he got rattled and ratty over it. Now, I need some one for this job who can keep cool and steady, very cool and very steady. No, he's a good fellow, but for this he just won't do at all.' And so if you and I in little things keep barging anywhere all over the road, are selfish and peevish and cross about just nothing at all, it doesn't seem to matter much, yet some day God will say, 'No, I've been watching them, and they won't do,' and will set us aside.

Far better keep our own side of the white line always, and in everything.

Fiddle and I.[1]

'Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee.'—2 Ti 1[6].

He is an old fiddle, richly marked and of beautiful tone. Lest he should catch cold he is always wrapped in an old shawl, and his home is a leather case, lined with green plush. But the loveliest thing about him is his voice; at times it is surpassing sweet, and its notes have won him many friends. But of late he has been silent—as mute as the harp that hung on Tara's walls. And I am sorry to say that the fault is mine. For the fiddle is mine, and he can only speak when I encourage him. I love him still, but for a long time I have had so many other things to do that I have left him alone. When I have occasionally spoken with him and tried to discourse sweet music, the voice has sounded so little like the old voice that I have put him away again, sad and disappointed.

But I took him out again the other day and gently caressed the strings with my fingers. The tone was still rich, but my fingers were stiff and out of practice and the notes came painfully. After a few minutes I put him down again and looked at him, and as I did so the room I was in seemed to vanish and I saw a little boy, about seven years of age, holding the fiddle for the first time. His arm was a little short and his fingers clumsy, but the teacher was very patient, and when the boy got tired and disappointed with his own efforts, the teacher took the violin and made it sing as though it was the easiest as well as the most beautiful thing in the world. After that he tried again, and though it was a long time coming, gradually he learned to make the fiddle say sweeter things. But it was a slow and painful business, especially when the teacher was not there to help, and the daily practice was the hardest thing of all. One, two, three, four; one, two, three, four—is it time to finish yet? One, two, three, four; one, two, three, four—I am sure that clock has stopped. One, two—oh dear, why do I have to practise when the sun is shining and the boys and girls are playing in the street? But time and patience work wonders. It was a great day when the 'Blue Bells of Scotland' was first tried. Then came 'The Minstrel Boy,' and after that 'Blue Bells of Scotland' with variations.

A few years later there came a great opportunity. The boy, who was still rather small, was given the chance to play in an orchestra with grown-up men and women. It is true he was hidden amongst the second fiddles, and he was told to get to practices very early so that he could put up the music-stands and save the men from getting their hands dirty. But he didn't mind that very much so long as he was allowed to play even second fiddle in some of the most wonderful music that was ever played.

Then came changes. The boy became bigger, left school, 'went to work,' lived away from home, found more and more to do. And now he stood looking at the silent fiddle and seeing pictures of what used to be.

'Fiddle,' I said, 'I am sorry about it all. Do

[1] By the Reverend Norman Goodall, M.A., Walthamstow.

you think we can ever get the music back again?'

'Why not?' asked the fiddle. 'I still have my voice and you have your fingers. What is there to hinder us?'

'I don't quite know what it is,' I answered. 'But you know as well as I do that there is a difference somewhere. Every time we have talked together lately we have both sounded awkward and disappointing.'

'And I think I can tell you why,' said the fiddle. 'First of all, you don't practise. And then you don't go to a teacher; you try to manage all by yourself and you stumble at difficulties which a master would explain. If you really want me to speak in the old tones and to make music that is lovelier than ever, you must first of all go to a master who knows more about it than you; and then you must practise hard, and do it every day, whether you "feel like it" or not.'

The fiddle said no more, and I slowly wrapped his shawl about him and tucked him in his green plush bed. But I knew he was right, and I knew that the music would come again if I took the trouble to practise and keep in touch with a wise master.

And what is true of the fiddle is true of the lives God has given us. Our lives were made for music—music like the song of the angels bringing peace on earth and goodwill amongst men. We don't learn to make it all at once. We have to grow and learn and begin with simple efforts, until the time comes when we can take our place in the great Orchestra of Life and help to fill the world with music. But while it is sometimes hard to learn, it is always easy to forget, and most of the troubles and sorrows in the world come because people forget. They grow careless and become busy with other things, and the music of life is left behind. And there's only one way to get it back. It is the way the fiddle talked about. We must practise daily, 'whether we feel like it or not,' and we must keep in touch with the Master. For Jesus was one who never forgot the music—the music of love and goodwill and unselfishness. And to those who have learned to follow the Master and give their lives to Him there have come the secret and the power to make music which grows richer and more glorious every year.

The Christian Year.

Twenty-fourth Sunday after Trinity.

Spiritual Growth.

'For this cause we also . . . do not cease to pray and make request for you, that ye may be filled with the knowledge of his will in all spiritual wisdom and understanding, to walk worthily of the Lord unto all pleasing, bearing fruit in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God.'—Col $1^{9.\ 10}$ (R.V.).

The scriptural conception of the saintly character and career is that of an ever-increasing strength and joyfulness. So far the scriptural conception is in agreement with the general law. It was said of William Pitt, 'He never grew; he was cast'; yet, as a rule, the normal person grows mentally in power and resource. Occasionally a youthful saint may astonish us by his completeness of character and exceptional ripeness of experience; but the law of the spiritual life is that we go from strength to strength.

Professor Rufus Jones in his recent book, *Finding the Trail of Life*, re-lives his boyhood in order to interpret the religion of a boy 'and to show the boy in his struggle to get through the jungle and to find the trail of life. . . . More real than the snow fort which we stormed amid a flight of snowballs until we dislodged the possessors of it, was this unseen stronghold of an enemy, who was dislodged only to come back into his fort stronger than ever, so that my assaults seemed fruitless and vain.

'When he was a boy on the frontier, going through a similar struggle, Abraham Lincoln wrote on his home-made arithmetic these verses:

> Abraham Lincoln,
> His book and pen:
> He will be good,
> But God knows when.

'I know precisely how he felt. . . . I now began to be haunted by the idea that I could never really like myself, that is, be satisfied, until I was every bit good, while all the time this attainment seemed an almost hopeless quest. The result was that I had, in this period, moments of wonderful happiness when I thought of the future life, and imagined myself an inhabitant of the heavenly city; followed by other times of depression, when I saw myself as I really was—far from heavenly in nature, and as unangelic as boys usually are. I kept up a

vague hope, which I sometimes put into a prayer, that by some miraculous event I might be made good, and so have the struggle done with; that, in a word, I might anticipate heaven, and find out here what it was like to be every whit good and do now the kind of things I should do when I got to be truly an angel.

'I think that my Uncle Eli more than anybody else helped me to realize—not by what he said, but by what he did—that this goodness of character which I was after is not something miraculous that drops into a soul out of the skies, but is rather something which is formed within as one faithfully does his set tasks, and goes to work with an enthusiastic passion to help make other people good.'

Many sincere Christians, whilst conscious of much in their life that is genuinely good, are distressed to find it so faint; they are almost as deeply abased by the sight of their virtues as pained by the evidence of their faults. Victor Hugo says of our Queen Anne, 'No quality of hers attained to virtue, none to vice.' Whatever we may say of ourselves concerning the latter, we have reason enough to lament the faintness of the former. We often need to pray:

> Forgive our faults, forgive our virtues, too,
> Those lesser faults, half-converts to the right.

But this need not always be. It is delightfully possible that the graces of to-day so sadly lacking in the glow and glory of life may become full of the bloom and sweetness of perfection. Luther Burbank, the Californian florist, has succeeded in raising out of a wild field daisy a blossom five to seven inches in diameter; gladioli of greatly enhanced beauty he has taught to flower around the entire stem, instead of on one side only; the poppy he has so enlarged that it measures ten inches across its brilliant bloom; and the amaryllis has increased in diameter from two inches to nearly a foot. Are not corresponding enlargements and transfigurations possible in our moral and spiritual life? Our present graces may be starved and meagre; our kindness, justice, truth, patience, purity, and love, of the meanest growth, no better than the coarse grasses and dwarf blossoms of the prairie; and yet how large their possibilities! How delicate and splendid these traits of Christian character when seen in the Master, and in the disciples who follow Him closely! And there is no strength, serenity, or charm that we admire in the elect that may not be reproduced in the weakest of us.

The origin of the Christian character is a new heart and a new spirit, and all development begins with that inward renewal, a renewal in the spirit of the mind. The culture of character may be attempted on other lines, prompted by different motives, dominated by independent models; but such culture is not Christian. Revelation teaches that character is based on a spiritual principle, a principle of life, and its growth in power and beauty implies a fuller expression of that life. It is therefore vain to seek the ennoblement of the outer life unless we are careful vigorously to maintain the interior life. 'I am the true vine. . . . Abide in me.' Here, then, is the vital truth, the principle of moral perfection is affiance in Christ. He is absolutely essential to the realization of all the high, far-off excellence of which we have an intuition and to which we sincerely aspire. In His presence we must dwell, His beauty contemplate, His merit trust, His love share, into His spirit drink, and in His steps we must follow.

We may borrow an illustration from another sphere to help us to understand this intimacy and oneness with our Lord. John Gibson, the famous sculptor, writes thus in his diary: 'I renewed my visits to the Vatican. It is not to criticize that I go there, but to seek instruction in my art, which the Greeks carried to perfection. Those few masterpieces which have come down to us, though I have dwelled upon them thousands of times, still at every new visit are contemplated by me with fresh wonder and admiration, such is the influence which anything perfect, both in design and execution, has upon the mind. Those grand works of the Greeks are ever new, and always produce fresh enchantment however often they may be surveyed.' Thus must we linger over the pages of the New Testament, contemplating closely and lovingly the living, speaking, active Jesus, whilst He grows upon us, more and more filling our imagination, mind, and heart. We can grow in strength and grace and blessedness only whilst this is our habit.

1. We must grow in the *knowledge* of Christ. To increase in the knowledge of Christ is to increase in the knowledge of God; He is the only true, saving, vivifying source of such knowledge. How prone we are to think that we already know Christ, when indeed we only know something about Him! There

are many degrees of knowledge, and we have not fully learned Christ until we know Him and the power of His resurrection. The tourist who, guide-book in hand, hurries through the Vatican galleries, may flatter himself that he knows the immortal masterpieces, and for the rest of his life talk as if he did; but he does not know them as Gibson did, who had 'dwelt upon them,' intently and sympathetically, 'thousands of times.' Really, only Gibson knew them at all. So, if we are to attain to the knowledge of Christ, a thousand times must He engage our thought and affection, and each time it will be with fresh wonder and admiration.

2. We must grow in the *faith* of Christ. Accepting Him as 'the way, the truth, and the life,' it is essential that we confide increasingly in Him as such. Then in the midst of trouble and mystery our souls will experience a deeper calm, being content to ask Him fewer anxious questions. But having confessed our sin with the sighings of a contrite heart, let us once for all, and with growing conviction, shelter in His merit, trust in His grace, expect His utmost salvation; and as He has given us solemn assurances for the great future, we may with unshaken faith boldly face death and the grave, resting upon His word and promise. 'That we may be no longer children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, in craftiness, after the wiles of error; but, dealing truly in love, may grow up in all things unto him, which is the head, even Christ.' In his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians St. Paul writes: 'We are bound to give thanks to God alway for you . . . for that your faith groweth exceedingly.' Ever more deeply satisfied with the hope of the gospel, let us once attain this 'full assurance,' and to us the promise shall be fulfilled: 'Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee: because he trusteth in thee.'

3. Lastly, we must grow in the *love* of Christ. How continually the apostles dwell upon this! To realize in our Saviour more vividly the goodwill of God to His creatures, His unfailing kindness and faithfulness, His eternal mercy and grace, until our heart glows responsively, this is to grow in the holiest passion of Divine love; and herein is plenty of room to grow. Shakespeare affirms:

> There lives within the very flame of love
> A kind of wick or snuff that will abate it.

Yet most of us know even a human love in which this, happily, is not true; and as we apprehend more clearly the love and beauty of God in the face of Jesus Christ, we become conscious of an adoring affection that no kind of wick or snuff can abate, and in this white inextinguishable flame our soul and its felicity are perfected.[1]

SUNDAY NEXT BEFORE ADVENT.

Fear in the Night.

'Every man hath his sword upon his thigh because of fear in the night.'—Ca 3^8.

What a vivid glance into the life of an Oriental monarch! Round Solomon's palanquin, decked with the luxury of the East, stand sixty chosen soldiers, fully armed, in order to ward off any nocturnal attack. The king's very sleep has to be protected against intrigues and conspiracies within the palace.

The uneasiness of the head that wears a crown has passed into a proverb, but proverbs are more often quoted than credited, and we may forget, in our envy of high rank, the well-worn story of its accompaniment. Our eyes are generally dazzled by the glitter of wealth and position when we look at those whose life seems to be one round of pleasure, apparently unvisited by any of the swarming cares that vex our lower level. It is only the sensible who stop to reflect that no success is without its penalties. The recollection of this might help to make us more considerate, for one thing. Misery does not always vaunt itself in rags and tears. There may be some secret fear in the night which haunts those who, in our vicinity, apparently have smooth and prosperous careers. And, for another thing, we might learn to be more contented with our own lot, instead of imagining that we could escape troubles by getting away to the high shores of the world where the tides of prosperity run brightly. Such positions are often won at the expense of heart's ease.

At the same time, it is not by accepting an obscure lot or by reducing our ambitions that we can escape fear in the night. That far-off Oriental scene—the palace in the night with its unsleeping bodyguard—is the counterpart of human existence. Many people who know nothing about palaces know what it is to be kept awake by the dread of the nameless, noiseless power against which they have to summon

[1] W. L. Watkinson, *The Shepherd of the Sea*, 123.

a host of good resolves and firm beliefs. Uneasiness about our health or prospects, doubts as to our usefulness in life, anxiety about our families or about our ability to hold out against temptation—these and countless other forms of evil haunt us, waking or sleeping. What are God's sentinels against such vexing thoughts? How does He strengthen life in face of the disturbing elements in its environment?

1. His first method of reinforcing us is by assuring us of *the value of the soul*. That is a conviction which brings its own peace and strength. Guards are set round what is precious, and man's first line of defence against the inroad of fear is the assurance that his life counts with his God, and counts greatly, even although he may seem to be numbered among

> The mere uncounted folk
> Of whose life and death is none
> Report or lamentation.

This faith, which underlies all religion, is a moral stay of the inward life. When a man allows himself to doubt if his existence matters anything at all, he lays himself open to depression at every turn. As the sense of his personal destiny is lowered, his sense of security also tends to diminish. But when he finds that God has honoured him with the calling and career of faith, he realizes that life is far too precious to be left at the mercy of accident or impulse. It is not a conviction which wealth and success invariably tend to deepen. On the contrary, as our possessions accumulate, there is a danger of imagining that our life consists in these, instead of in the character of the possessor. Whatever be our lot outwardly, and sometimes the humbler it is the better, we must learn that God trusts us with life, that we are responsible to Him for this royal gift of personality, and that He in turn is responsible for us. We must recognize, in the light of Jesus, that it is not a matter of indifference what we make of ourselves. No guard of high resolves and steady faith surrounds the man who is simply living for appearances and selfish ends. But when we take life on God's high terms, faith breathes into us a new dignity and self-possession; we are steadied by the revelation that the meaning of life's discipline is the growth of our souls into the likeness and the mind of Christ. In the thought of that, guaranteed by the life which Jesus has revealed and which He lives to realize, we can take refuge from disturbing fears about our future.

2. Another sentry stands armed before the chamber of the soul: it is *the instinct of danger*. The sense of its own value prompts life intuitively to protect itself against peril. Our moral being seems to have a mysterious shrinking from temptation, which corresponds to the instinct that makes insects avoid contact with certain plants or animals. The innocent heart recoils at a touch of coarseness. Conscience warns, or rather it forewarns, us against compromising associations, and the lurking sense of discomfort in certain pursuits or pleasures is often a wise movement of Nature, not a mere caprice of dislike. 'It is one great security against sin,' as Newman said, 'to be shocked at it.' No doubt it is an instinct of repulsion which we may easily kill. But if we do harden ourselves to compromise with moral evil or to scoff at sin, the soul is left a prey to fear, and to worse than fear. To lose the sense of being ashamed at what once made us uneasy, is not a proof of moral strength: it is no evidence of safety to become indifferent to what we are now pleased to dismiss as idle scruples and outworn prejudices. Moral purity and power are not ensured by any such hardening of conscience. It ought to be as natural for us in the spiritual as in the physical life to suspect and shrink from what would injure us. Such vague antipathies and aversions may sometimes be due to narrow training or to unenlightened prejudice, but they are often part of the defensive power granted by God to the human soul in a world where life is repeatedly surrounded by spurious and contaminating influences. We tamper with them at our peril.

3. Finally, there is a safeguard of life in *obedience to the will of God*. 'In his will is our peace,' in knowing it, in doing it, and in bearing it. Restlessness is sometimes due to the secret feeling that we are following our own bent. And there is no peace for the wilful or the wayward. As soon as we sit loose to any of the duties in which the will of God meets us, the inward life becomes unsettled; it is a breach of harmony with the ruling purpose of our world, and through the breach excitement and unsteadiness creep in. When people are constantly on the outlook for self-gratification, whether their pleasures are refined or low, when they clutch at all that comes their way and fret when they miss it, when their chief thought is about their own

rights and wishes, it is no wonder that this self-will dissipates their inward peace of mind. Restlessness is the inevitable result of depending upon external things like popularity or ambition for the interests of life. It is duty that steadies us. The surrendered will enters into the quiet strength of God's will as a will of goodness and love. 'Peace I leave with you; my peace I give unto you,' said Jesus on His last evening. He could say that, because He could also say: 'As the Father gave me commandment, even so I do.'

Be our circumstances or surroundings, therefore, what they may, here are the safeguards of the soul, within reach of the humblest, and indispensable to the strongest and most fortunate. For the threshold of fear can be crossed so easily! Harassing care and dread can thrust their way in, no matter what is our age or income or position. And where is our defence, where but in God's faith and faithfulness, worked into the moral experience of those who keep in touch with the realities of His life?[1]

ADVENT SUNDAY.

The Incarnation and Human Life.

'The last Adam became a life-giving spirit.'—1 Co 15^{45} (R.V.).

1. *The Incarnation and Human Nature.* The Incarnation is a great revelation of God. It declares what God is in His essential being. It reveals His redeeming passion and His love. The Incarnation did not create that passion and love. They were in God all the time. Love is His nature; Father is His everlasting name; but His love and His Fatherhood were both hidden till Christ came. The Incarnation declared them and made them manifest. It is in it we perceive the essential dignity and greatness of human nature—it was great enough to contain the Eternal Son of God. One of the best theological treatises ever written was that by Anselm on the question, 'Why did God become a man?' That led Anselm at once to the discussion of sin and of atonement. But there is a question just as vital and important which concerns the Incarnation itself, and it is this, 'How did God become a man?'

The answer to that question is this, that God could incarnate Himself in man because there was an essential kinship between the human and the Divine. Augustine says, and says quite truly, that the Divine became human in order that the human might become Divine. But this also is true (and to that extent Augustine's saying needs to be supplemented and corrected), that the Divine was able to become human only because the human already partook of the nature of the Divine. For, like God, man is a moral personality. Of course there had to be a great self-emptying on the part of God to become a man. But the possibility of Incarnation was present because man was a moral personality like Himself. God could not incarnate Himself in stars and suns, vast though they are, for stars and suns are just masses of unthinking, unfeeling matter. But He could incarnate Himself in man because man was a thinking, feeling, willing, moral being. The ground of the Incarnation is the great truth that God and man are essentially akin. This is the representation of man that we get in the Bible. When God had finished the work of creation, according to the old Genesis story, He said, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.'

The final proof of the greatness of human nature lies here—it is such a nature that the eternal Son of God could use it and wear it and inhabit it. It is akin to the Divine. And it was the birth at Bethlehem that made all this obvious and clear. It did not create the greatness of human nature; it revealed it—revealed it as so intrinsically and essentially sacred and Divine a thing, that the Son of God could become a man, a real man, and yet be the eternal Son all the time. The Incarnation has ennobled and glorified human nature. It is impossible for us ever to think meanly or to speak disparagingly about it again. 'The true Shekinah of God is man,' said Carlyle. But the Apostle Paul had already said the same thing in simpler but still sublimer fashion when he said, 'Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the spirit of God dwelleth in you?'

This truth about the essential greatness and sacredness of human nature is certainly no 'mere doctrine.' It has the most direct and potent influence upon life. If you think meanly of a thing, you can never do justice by it. Mean thoughts of human nature will lead directly to mean uses of it. And there are certain things that tend to make us think meanly of it.

(1) There is first our accentuated and deepened sense of the insignificance of man as compared with the vastness of the universe. Science has

[1] J. Moffatt, *Reasons and Reasons*, 169.

given us an infinitely larger universe than our fathers ever dreamed of. It has multiplied space till it has become almost boundless; and extended time till it has become almost infinite. And in contrast with it all the littleness of man has become emphasized, until some men become almost paralysed by a realization of their own insignificance. They argue that in such a universe they do not count, and what they do does not matter. And reasoning of that kind leads straight to useless and sometimes to very unworthy living. If we are to live nobly we must be delivered from everything that savours of self-contempt. And the way to such deliverance is to remember who and what we are. Bulk is no criterion of worth. You can balance on the tip of your finger a gem that shall out-price Snowdon. We must refuse to be terrified by this emphasis on mere mass.

(2) And if, on the one hand, the contrast between the universe and the individual makes us think poorly of human nature—so also do the things we see in man himself. For human nature as we see it in actual experience is often debased, degraded, sensual, vile. There are human beings who inspire us with nothing but aversion and disgust—they are so unspeakably base and foul. Our temptation is to despise all such and despair of them. But, if we either despise or despair of them, we shall be wholly unable to save and redeem them. We shall do with them as the Pharisees did with the publicans and sinners of their day—leave them to perish. The only way in which we shall be able to do our duty by the lapsed and the lost is to look at them in the light of the Incarnation. In spite of all their degradation and sin, those lost men and women possess the same human nature as Jesus did. They, too, are *capax Dei*, able to receive and contain God. Christ may be born again in them. Realizing that about them we shall despise none and despair of none.

2. *The Incarnation and Human Relationships.* Our Lord did not come into the world as a detached and isolated Person. He was a second Adam—a new starting-point for the race. But He was not unrelated with that portion of the race which preceded Him. In a real way He derived from it, He was intimately connected with it. He was a shoot out of the stock of Jesse. He was of the house and lineage of David. He was born the son of Mary. He entered into the various relationships of life. He began by being a little child in the home. He was subject to His parents; He was a pupil in the school of Nazareth; He was an elder brother to a number of brothers and sisters; He filled His place in the community; He paid His taxes; He was a loyal citizen of His State. And in all these relations—these everyday human relations—He was the Holy Son of God. By becoming Incarnate and living our life, Christ has shown how holy and sacred all these relationships can be made. Christ did not make them sacred by entering into them—but by entering into them He revealed to us how great and sacred and beautiful they are when rightly discharged. These relationships cover very much the whole of human life. What the Incarnation has taught us is that we can live as the children of God in every one of them.

We can make our family relationships sacred and Divine. They are such when rightly discharged. They are often enough the very reverse of sacred and beautiful. There is friction where there ought to be harmony; selfishness where there ought to be loving service; rebellion where there ought to be glad obedience. Life would be a different thing for multitudes of us if only we were wise and gracious parents, obedient children, unselfish and helpful brothers and sisters!

We can make our civic and state relationships sacred and Divine. Jesus paid His taxes, paid them scrupulously and honestly. 'Render to Cæsar,' He said, 'the things that are Cæsar's.' He made his very citizenship a Divine and sacred thing. And so may we. State life has become more complex since Christ's day. It touches us at more points. Now the State—I do not say any particular form of State—is a Divine institution. Our citizen relationship is a sacred relationship. Our obligations to the State are not to be evaded; they are to be punctiliously and cheerfully discharged. And perhaps there is nothing we need more at such a time as this than the exaltation of our whole conception of citizenship. It is not a profane but a sacred relation. In our payment of our taxes and the discharge of our other State responsibilities we can act as children of God.

3. *The Incarnation and Daily Toil.* The Incarnation has glorified and ennobled all our human labour. For fifteen years Jesus was in the carpenter's shop and worked at the carpenter's trade. And all the time while He was mending ploughs and chairs and building the houses of the people of

Nazareth, making the doors and fitting in the windows, He was in His Father's house and about His Father's business. His labour was a sacred and holy thing. I think that was why Jesus entered a carpenter's home and Himself became a joiner. He wanted to show the glory and divineness of all labour. Amongst the Romans and Greeks especially all manual toil was despised, and was largely left to the slave. Now, if Jesus had been born as a member, say, of the professional classes, that pernicious heresy might have endured and become more and more widespread, and the countless millions who toil with their hands might have thought their labour was a profane and almost contemptible thing. But our Lord redeemed those tasks we think humble from any touch of secularity by Himself becoming a carpenter. For He did His carpenter's work as the Holy Son of God.

There is a familiar little poem which seeks to express the feelings of an old joiner at finding Jesus was a carpenter:

'Isn't this Joseph's son?'—ay, it is He;
Joseph the carpenter—same trade as me—
I thought as I'd find it—I knew it was here—
But my sight's getting queer.

I don't know right where, as His shed must ha' stood,
But often, as I've been a-planing my wood,
I've took off my hat, just with thinking of He
At the same work as me.

He warn't that set up that He couldn't stoop down
And work in the country for folks in the town;
And I'll warrant He felt a bit pride, like I've done,
At a good job begun.

So I comes right away by mysen, with the book,
And I turns the old pages and has a good look
For the text as I've found, as tells me as He
Were the same trade as me.

There is a story told that an artist,—humble and unknown,—after gazing at one of the great pictures of one of the Master painters, was overheard to say in a kind of ecstasy, 'I too am an artist.' After gazing at Jesus, we too may well be moved to cry with gratitude and wonder, 'I too am a man.' For what the Incarnation has taught us is this, that every son of man may become a Son of God.[1]

[1] J. D. Jones, *Watching the Cross*, 55.

Second Sunday in Advent.

The True and Living Way.

'Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.'—Jn 14^{6}.

The confession of Thomas, 'Lord, we know not whither thou goest; and how can we know the way?' compels Jesus to lay aside all figurative language, through which the prosaic minds of the disciples could not pierce to the moral and spiritual truth taught, and to declare plainly that the Father is His destination, and that He Himself in His life and teachings has shown, and is, the direction in which men must move to reach that destination. The goal of man's life is the Father, and the only course which can bring men to that goal is Himself, and that for two reasons: because He, as the truth, brings God to men by His revelation, and because He, as the life, brings men to God by His redemption. The clause, 'I am the way, and the truth, and the life,' is a Hebraic mode of expression, and in our English fashion of speech would be expressed, 'I am the true and the living way.'

1. *The Goal.* Language is too poor to express spiritual relations adequately and accurately. Jesus speaks of going to the Father Himself, and of men coming to the Father by Him, when He does not mean a change of place but a change of state. To come to the Father means for man to think God's truth, to do God's holy will, to feel God's joy, to live in God's love. It is the mental, moral, and spiritual ascent of the human personality to the fulness of light, life, and love in the Divine personality. Man is made by God for God, and becomes himself only as he becomes one with God, not in an impersonal absorption but in a personal union.

The fact of sin as it hinders man's realization of his sonship, so it affects God's manifestation and communication of His Fatherhood. Sin is not merely an arrest of man's development Godwards; it is a misdirection of that development away from, and even against, God; it is an interruption of that ever-closer fellowship with God which goes with man's growing likeness to God. Coming to the Father on the lips of Christ does not mean, as for many modern thinkers, the realization of our personality in its affinity through communion with God, but it does mean God's love seeking and saving the lost, forgiving sinners, receiving the prodigal son to the heart and home of the Father.

The coming to the Father in ever-closer fellowship and ever-growing likeness is a process not completed in this earthly life but continued in heaven, for in the Father's house are many mansions. The hope of immortality is rooted in, and withers if severed from, the faith in God's Fatherhood. Death for Christ was a going to the Father; and with all reverence for His perfect personality, His own desire to depart warrants us in affirming that even for Him death did mean a clearer vision, a closer communion, and a freer and fuller obedience. Limitations of the expression and exercise of His sonship were removed by death. Death, then, for man, as for the Son of Man, is a condition of the approach to God. The progress in truth, blessedness, holiness, love, which is here begun, is not ended by death, but even enters on a new stage. Jesus' words would suggest that death is a great advantage to the soul as the beginning of a new stage of that Fatherward development of man, and a stage which is marked by so great an advance that, for those to whom to live is Christ, death itself is gain. As the Divine Fatherhood has subdued sin to its purpose of love, making the experience of forgiveness better even than the sense of innocence, so it has also made death the minister of a greater good.

2. *The Way.* In the relation of God to man the Christian religion asserts and insists on the mediation of Jesus Christ. This is not a mistaken tribute of affection, gratitude, and adoration to Him, but a simple acceptance of the claim He makes for Himself. He is the Way; it is through Him God is revealed as Father, and man is redeemed as son.

Just as in man's body there are organs of sensation and organs of movement, and in his brain afferent and efferent nerves, so in his consciousness there is cognition and conation. While he is active in both, yet in the former he is receptive, in the latter he is initiative. In the one the world impresses itself on him, in the other he impresses himself on it. The mediation of God by Christ has also a twofold aspect. To man as cognitive He is the truth, to man as conative He is the life. As the way He reveals God to man, and redeems man to God. God seeks to be worshipped in spirit and in truth, for God Himself is true. Men who abide in the word of Christ are His disciples, and they will know the truth, and the truth will make them free. In the Fourth Gospel truth means not only subjective sincerity and objective veracity; it means even ultimate reality. Jesus is the Truth not only because He meant to speak truly, and because in fact what He spoke was true, but because in Him man is in immediate contact and intimate communion with what is absolutely and eternally real.

That man may come to God he must know God as He is. It is not necessary that he should know everything about God. There are secrets of His wisdom and resources of His power, to say nothing of glories of His perfection, which man has not the capacity to know and understand. What he needs to know is all of God which concerns his relation to God as Father. What Jesus revealed of God was not all that the man of science may want to know or the philosopher to understand, but the one thing religion craves to be sure of, the relation in which God stands to man, the Divine Fatherhood. Here is man's contact with ultimate reality, and it is a real contact. We do not believe God is Father because the belief works for our succour, comfort, and progress. It can so work only as we are sure that our belief is true. This certainty Jesus gives us not in word and deed only, but in life itself. He not only speaks and does the truth, He is the Truth. In His sonship, His trust in, love for, and surrender to God, the Fatherhood of God becomes a present reality in the life of man. In His grace to sinners, the love of God as forgiving sin becomes a present reality for sinful mankind. The certainty about God's Fatherhood and the forgiveness of sin at last communicates itself to us, and the Truth He is becomes the truth which we can hold without doubt or question.

In describing Christ as the Truth which becomes our truth, we have already passed to the second aspect of His mediation, for He is not only before us, but in us. He is the Life. This truth—that Christ is not an external testimony about God merely, but an internal influence of God—runs throughout the Fourth Gospel. He is the Living Bread, of which if any man eat he shall live for ever. He is the Resurrection and the Life. The reality of God which as truth He reveals, He realizes in us as life.

Not only is there, but there must be, the dependence of man on God as Creator, in whom we live, and move, and have our being; for human existence depends on Divine immanence. But still more in the conscious voluntary relation of

man as son to God as Father, man has only what God gives. He thinks truly only as God's truth takes possession of him; he loves fully only as God's love makes his heart its home; he acts rightly only as he wills God's will in himself. And this fulness of God comes to man in Jesus Christ. There may be a genuine Christian experience and a sincere Christian character in which this immediate contact, intimate communion, and indispensable communication with Christ is not prominent in the consciousness—the man knows himself living rather than having Christ in his life. But in the more intense types of piety this constant indwelling and continuous inworking of Christ in the human progress in goodness and grace is ever frankly confessed.

There is an exclusiveness in the Christian faith which is found in no other religion. It makes claims for Christ which no other religion makes for its founder. The monopoly of sole Mediatorship that it asserts is not an exaggerated compliment which a fond fancy for Him inspires. It is an echo of His voice; and if the claim made for Him is unwarranted, the blame must fall on Him. 'No man cometh unto the Father but by me.' He is, as the true and living way, the only way to the Father. It is a historical fact that religion as a filial relation to God is found only where Christ's revelation of God's Fatherhood is known. No other religion has offered the world the same gospel. This fact is the inspiration of the foreign mission enterprise. If human personality is to fulfil its promise in union with Divine Personality, if the sinner is to be changed into the son of God, Christ must be known, trusted, and obeyed as Saviour and Lord. If the claim He makes for Himself, which the history of man's religion justifies, that He alone brings men to God as Father be true and not false, it must be the constant purpose and the strenuous effort of all in whom this relation to God has been realized to secure its universal realization. The path of duty is clear.[1]

[1] A. E. Garvie, *The Master's Comfort and Hope*, 85.

The Early Christian Interpretation of the Passover.

By J. Rendel Harris, Litt.D., LL.D., D.D., Birmingham.

The modern student of the history of the Church, whether he is occupied with its antecedent Judaism, or its recrudescent and neo-Judaism, has no difficulty in assigning an origin to the Passover, or to the Easter Festival which has taken its place. He knows from the twelfth chapter of Exodus, with the assistance of the happy translator's instinct of the English Bible, that Passover means what it says, that the word is jointed in the middle and will easily come apart; some one or some thing passed over some other person or things, and the historical explanation in the Book of Exodus is that the Destroying Angel of the offended Jahweh passed over the blood-marked houses of the Israelites, and that this motion of the Destroyer is called in Hebrew *Pesach*, or, as we say, Pass-over.

But even in the English Bible there is a suspicion that the incident recorded need not be the Judgment upon the Egyptians. In the Song of Triumph by the Red Sea, which is the original Paschal Hymn, the singers affirm that 'the enemy will be as still as a stone, until thy people pass over, thy people whom thou hast redeemed.' If the English Bible were an accurate reflex of the Hebrew, we should say at once that the real Passover was the *passage* of the Israelites *through* the Red Sea. At this point a difficulty arises: the word translated Pass Over is not the word previously used (*Pesach*), but another word (*'Abar*). The same word, however, has been used previously (Ex 12^{23}) as an alternative to the more usual word, and the translators have given us their perception of the linguistic variation by saying:

> 'The Lord will pass *through* to smite the Egyptians; . . . The Lord will pass *over* the door, and will not suffer the destroyer to come into your houses to smite you.'

It seems clear, then, that the word *passover* might describe either the motion of the Destroying

Angel or the Crossing of the Red Sea. To the average student of divinity it will be the former explanation that is accepted. He will not even notice that there is another.

That is all very well for English scholars; it is, however, easy to show that such a simple solution did not present itself to the early Fathers of the Church, many of whom knew little Hebrew, and despised what little they did know. Suppose, however, we turn to St. Jerome, who did know Hebrew, and let other people know that he knew it. In his commentary on Micah (*Opp.* vii. 530) we have as follows:

> 'exterminator in Aegypto *transcendit* populum Israel, et non vastavit eum (unde a *transitu, Phase,* id est, *pascha,* nomen accepit).'

Here we have two Latin renderings of the Hebrew word for Passover, which would answer to the two Greek words ὑπερβαίνω and διαβαίνω, and we have each word applied to the Destroying Angel, unless the second word is an anticipation of the Passage of the Red Sea. Now let us turn to Jerome's commentary on Matthew (*Opp.* viii. 210), where he is discussing the same philological problem. He tells us:

> '*Pascha,* quod Hebraice dicitur *Phase,* non a *passione,* ut plerique arbitrantur, sed a *transitu* nominatur, eo quod Exterminator, videns sanguinem in foribus Israelitarum, *pertransierit,* et non percusserit eos. Vel quia Dominus praebens auxilium populo suo *desuper* ambulaverit. . . . Transitus autem noster, id est *Phase,* celebratur, si terrena et Aegyptum dimittentes, ad caelestia festinemus.'

The explanation which Jerome gives is interesting, and like a good commentator he is multiplex. First of all, he warns us off from a popular derivation of πάσχα from πάσχω (or *Passover* from *Passion*): then he has two translations which correspond to the Greek διαβαίνω and ὑπερβαίνω. Of these the first is applied to the Destroyer, and to the people crossing the Red Sea; the second is proper to the Lord, aiding His people *from above.* Then Jerome adds a mystical explanation according to which the Passover is the flight from Egypt, which is the real διάβασις. It is very like the language of Heb 11, where Moses keeps the *Passover,* to avoid the Exterminator (ὁ ὀλοθρεύων), and where the Israelites *passed through* (διέβησαν) the Red Sea, as on dry land. We begin to suspect that the explanation of *Passover* as *Passing through* is very early.

Now let us see what Gregory of Nazianzus will say on the subject, from the standpoint of Greek theology.

In his *Oration on the Holy Passover* (*P.G.* 36, col. 636) he tells us that this great and venerable *Passover* or *Pascha* was called *Phasca* by the Hebrews, and in their language it signifies transit (διάβασις). The transit in question is the Flight from Egypt, and Return to Canaan. Spiritually it is an *Anabasis* as well as a *Diabasis,* an ascent from things below to things above. Gregory then goes on to explain, half apologetically, that names in the Scripture are often changed from obscurity to clearness, and from rusticity to elegance. That is why Christians changed *Phasca* to *Pascha,* because they saw in the word, when Hellenized, a remembrance of the Lord's Passion (τὸ σωτήριον πάθος). Gregory is much more friendly than Jerome to the derivation from πάσχω. On the one hand, he is a Greek, and likes a Greek play on words, and on the other, he is the author of the poem which he calls *Christus patiens.* He differs from the modern exegete in making the Passover the act of the Israelite people, and not of the Destroying Angel.

It is pretty clear that the explanations referred to have a long ancestry, and we propose to show that they are substantially the interpretations of the New Testament itself. Suppose we begin with the suggestion which Jerome disallows and which Gregory of Nazianzus patronizes, that πάσχα has something to do with Passover and with the Greek verb πάσχω.

We will begin with Irenæus. In the twentieth chapter of the fourth book against Heresies, he tells us that Moses foretold the advent of Christ, the time of the Passion, and the place in which Christ suffered. The chapter is based upon a collection of *Testimonies against the Jews.* It opens with our Lord's words to them, in which He advises them to search the Scriptures for *Testimonies* concerning Himself. Irenæus goes on to say that Moses foretold the day of the *Passion,* calling it *Pascha,* and that on that very day, so long foretold by Moses, our Lord fulfilled the *Passover* by *Suffering* on it: (*passus est* Dominus adimplens *Pascha*). It is quite clear that Irenæus, or the collection of *Testimonies* which he is using, must be held to have acquaintance with the equation between πάσχα and πάσχω.

The same thing can be observed in Tertullian's treatise *against the Jews* (c. 10) where he uses the *Testimonies* in a similar manner to show the Christian significance of the Passover; he says:

> 'Moses prophesied that you (*i.e.* the Jews) would do this thing in the beginning of the first month, when all the populace of the children of Israel were to sacrifice the lamb in the evening; and the solemnity of this day, that is the Passover of unleavened bread, which you were to eat with bitterness, he chanted beforehand and added the words, It is the *Lord's Passover*, that is *Christ's Passion*.'

So here we have the parallel between Passover and Passion, a parallel which must have been made in Greek, which has been shown to be at least as early as the second century. We shall now show that it is a first-century explanation, and at the same time that the explanation of *Passover* alternatively as πάσχα or *Passing Over* of the People, and the spiritual interpretation of the Transit, which we saw in Jerome and Gregory, belong to the same period.

First of all we turn to the Gospel of St. Luke, where our Lord is represented as saying to His disciples at the Last Supper,

> 'I should much have liked to eat this Passover with you before I suffer'; τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν (Lk 22^{15}).

No person of Greek birth and training could miss the play on words which St. Luke here introduces. It is not, and cannot be, Aramaic. St. Luke represents our Lord as having made the connexion between the Passover and His own Passion. The importance of this observation for the criticism of the Lucan account is very great. If St. Luke is correct, our Lord is aware of the parallel between πάσχα and πάσχω, and may even be responsible for it.

But now let us turn aside and see what non-Christian writers of the first century have to say about the Passover, when they are explaining the Festival to Greek readers. Let us turn to Philo and Josephus.

Josephus naturally keeps as close as possible to the Biblical account, and Philo as naturally avoids the literal interpretation. Josephus translates *Passover* by ὑπερβασία. 'We call this Festival Pascha, and it means the *Passing Over* (ὑπερβασία), because on that day God *passed us* over, and sent the plague upon the Egyptians.' We note the use of the verb ὑπερβαίνειν, which we detected also in Jerome's explanation. What Josephus calls ὑπερβασία Philo describes as a διάβασις. The Passover is the migration of the mortal and corruptible to the immortal and incorruptible (διάβασις . . . τὸ πάσχα εἴρηται). Evidently Philo is not interpreting the Passover of the Destroying Angel, but of the emigrant Israelites, returning to their own country; and he interprets it mystically, and shows at the same time that he knows of the linguistic connexion between πάσχα and πάσχω. 'It was ordered that the Passover should be kept, a *Passing Over* from the *Passions* to the virtuous and disciplined life'; καὶ γὰρ τὸ πάσχα, τὴν ἐκ παθῶν εἰς ἄσκησιν ἀρετῆς διάβασιν προστέτακται ποιεῖσθαι (Philo, *de sacr. Abelis et Caini*).

We have seen, then, that all the explanations, literal and mystical, of the word Pascha, can be found in the first century.

We will now give a further illustration from the New Testament of the way in which the Passover was put into a Greek dress, over and above the πάσχα–πάσχω of Luke, the διάβασις of Philo and later writers, and the ὑπερβασία of Josephus.

The thirteenth chapter of the Gospel of St. John opens with the statement that Jesus knew the time was come for His return to the Father, and in the sense of that removal He emphasized by sacramental acts and speech the love which He had for His disciples. The section of the Gospel is sharply divided from what precedes, and opens as follows:

> 'Now, before the feast of the Passover, Jesus knew that His hour was come, to migrate from this world to the Father' (ἵνα μεταβῇ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα).

Here we have a slight variation on the Greek words which we found in use for the Passover, such as ὑπερβασία, διάβασις, but the same interpretation. We now add μεταβαίνω, observing that the Evangelist himself invites us to see that it is Passover language that he is using. Jesus' hour is equated with the Passover on the one hand, and with the Passover migration on the other. The language is Philonean rather than Lucan, and there is no suggestion of a play on words between πάσχα and πάσχω.

These, then, are the two chief early Christian interpretations of the Passover; one of them leads to the Lamb without blemish, the other to the City of God.

Recent Foreign Theology.

God and Nature.

This volume[1] is a conspicuous example of the thoroughness of German learning. Printed as the books are in English, it would run to about 1600 pages; and every page is loaded with matter—sound knowledge and keen judgment. It would be quite impossible within the space which must necessarily be assigned to such a review to give an adequate account of its contents, or appreciation of its merits. On the one hand the writer seems to be quite at home in the realm of science, and on the other no less so in the field of Christian theology. A brief outline must be attempted as an inducement to readers to venture into this widely-spread and yet well-ordered region. In his introduction the author discusses the nature of the scientific investigation of Nature, and of the religious consciousness, and their relation. The first chapter deals with the significance of Nature for religion and its history. In the second chapter he describes how in the history of Christendom Nature has been regarded from the scientific and the religious standpoint. The next three chapters discuss the discoveries and hypotheses of modern science in physics, chemistry, biology, and anthropology. The treatment here is objective and not apologetic; the author lets science speak without any ban of theology. Then in chapter six he tries to show the religious value of the scientific world-view. Having thus explored religion on the one hand and science on the other in regard to Nature, he places both in the wider context of the philosophy of culture and the theory of knowledge as parts of the organism of human thought. The last chapter is constructive; it deals with those last questions for thought, regarding which science and religion come into contact, and have sometimes been engaged in conflict. Needless to add that his aim is to show that there can be concord. The volume has an adequate index of names and subjects, and an admirable table of contents. The author can be commended for his meticulous care in the details of his book, about which many writers are regardless of the legitimate expectations of their readers. There are many passages well worth quoting; but I must content myself with his closing sentences. 'Who believes at all in the power of the spirit, and such practical idealists there are among theoretical positivists and materialists, cannot close his mind to the fact that religion also, despite all offences and hesitations of which it has been the occasion, is the most powerful revelation of the spirit, which mankind displays, and that without it a new, higher development of culture, as we long for it, is impossible. For the salvation of humanity scientific knowledge of Nature and genuine piety must come to understand one another. This book had as its motive the conviction that this accord is possible, that a great influence is assigned to it in the future, and it has sought to lay a foundation for this conviction' (p. 831). The foundation has been well and truly laid; this book is a valuable contribution to the fulfilment of the prophecy of a reconciliation of science and religion in the discovery that through Nature, as science interprets it, we may rise to Nature's God, as religion experiences His perfect, blessed, gracious, and glorious reality.

A. E. Garvie.

London.

[1] *Natur und Gott: Ein Versuch zur Verständigung zwischen Naturwissenschaft und Theologie*, von D. Arthur Titiuis (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926, S. x and 851).

Contributions and Comments.

Some Displacements in the Fourth Gospel.

There are several problems connected with the Fourth Gospel which appear to arise out of displacements of the text. A notorious passage is 7^{53}–8^{11}. So also is the early position of the Temple Cleansing. There appears to be a break in the sense somewhere about 3^{13-16}. The short section 3^{31-36} seems to be out of place. The 'feast' of 5^{1},

again, is a well-known difficulty. And there are others. Whether the following suggestions (they pretend to be no more than that) attempt too much, the reader must judge.

I would begin by endorsing the suggestion offered by Professor J. Hugh Michael in the June number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (p. 428 f.), that 3^{31-36} should follow immediately on 3^{1-13}. This leaves 3^{14-21} to be placed elsewhere. It may follow 3^{31-36} in its new position; but it fits just as well, if not better, after 12^{50}. But 12^{44-50} also seems disconnected from 12^{36b-43}; and I agree with the familiar suggestion (Moffatt) that it should follow 12^{20-36a}; while I should put 12^{36b-43} after the newly placed 3^{14-21}. This section will then read 12^{20-36a}–12^{44-50}–3^{14-21}–12^{36b-43}. The reasons for these alterations, however, are mostly subjective, so I will go on to more objective positions.

Chapters 3, 7, and 12 certainly appear to have been disturbed. Along with 3^{1-13} goes 2^{13-25}. The Temple Cleansing of 2^{13b-22}: 'And Jesus went up to Jerusalem,' etc., fits in admirably after 12^{19}; and 7^{53}–8^{11} comes in well afterwards. This gives us the Triumphal Entry as followed by the Temple Cleansing, as we find it in the Synoptic Gospels (omitting, with Luke, the incident of the Barren Fig Tree). The objective connecting link is found in Mk 11^{19} (11^{15-18} is the Temple Cleansing): 'And every evening he went forth out of the city,' taken along with Lk $21^{37.\ 38}$: 'And every night he went out, and lodged in the mount that is called *the mount* of Olives. And all the people came early in the morning to him in the temple, to hear him.' Compare this with Jn 7^{53}–8^{2}: 'And they went every man unto his house: but Jesus went unto the mount of Olives. And early in the morning he came again into the temple, and all the people came unto him; and he sat down, and taught them.'

If the above suggestions are tentatively accepted, 2^{13a} is left pendant. If to it we add 5^{1b-47}, the sense is perfect: (2^{13a}) 'And the passover of the Jews was at hand,' (5^{1b}) 'and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.' We may also add (with Dr. Moffatt) 7^{15-24} after 5^{47}. But what of 5^{1a}? My suggestion is that it is an interpolation necessitated by the displacements in the original Gospel. The original sentence (2^{13a} and 5^{1b}) ran: καὶ ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἀνέβη Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. Note that the words τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἀνέβη are common to both passages. After the dislocation had occurred it was found that the 5^{15} passage began with only part of the words τῶν Ἰουδαίων, and since the following words showed that Jesus went up to Jerusalem, probably to some Festival, the editor or copyist prefixed, μετὰ ταῦτα ἦν ἑορτή (a pretty safe guess; but vague, as he did not know which Feast), and inserted whatever letters were missing to complete the words τῶν Ἰουδαίων; part of which he found in his copy. Note that on the other sixteen occasions in Jn. when ἑορτή is used, it is always preceded by the article, which is here omitted. Alternatively it may be supposed that the division of the papyrus occurred lengthways along the line of the words in common: τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἀνέβη, leaving them readable on both fragments. The usual length of a line in Codex B is about eighteen letters.

Chapter 5 (with or without the addendum of 7^{15-24}) will then be followed by 3^{22-30} 4^{54} and $6^{1ff.}$. If this arrangement is adopted, 2^{23}–3^{13} (with 3^{31-36}), left in the air by the removal of both its contexts, may be added to 7^{15-24}; in which case the section will read, . . . 2^{13a} 5^{1b-47} 7^{15-24} 2^{23}–$3^{13.\ 31-36.\ 22-30}$ 4^{1-54} 6^{1}. . . . But 2^{23}–$3^{13.\ 31-36}$ may just as fitly go along with the previously transferred (to follow 12^{19}) 2^{13b-22}, with 7^{53}–8^{12} between the two; and the whole will then read 12^{19} 2^{13b-22} 7^{53}–8^{11} 2^{23}–$3^{13.\ 31-36}$ 12^{20-36} $^{44-50}$ 3^{14-21} 12^{36b-43} 13^{1}.

Incidentally it will be seen the troublesome 'Unknown Feast' of 5^{1} has disappeared; other apparent discrepancies with the Synoptists are smoothed out, and the 'Pericope Adulterae' is reinstated as canonical (that it should have been omitted by many of the best MSS. is easily intelligible), while the only textual emendation is in 5^{1a}.

THOS. COTTAM.

Market Harborough.

The Arrangement of the Texts in the Third Chapter of St. John.

IT is due to Professor Hugh Michael that I should register my assent or dissent in reference to his suggestion that in this chapter vv.$^{31-36}$ originally stood between v.^{13} and v.^{14} (pp. 428–429).

It must be dissent. We cannot accept every ingenious rearrangement of text founded on likeness of sentiment in the passages concerned. It is true that vv.$^{31-36}$ do not follow v.^{21} as a develop-

ment of the thought of v.[21]. But why should we expect this? v.[21] concludes one great statement; vv.[31-36] is another, completing the chapter (as we call it) vv.[1-21. 31-36]. Moreover, in my book, on which Professor Michael is working, there is a 'key' to which all my rearrangements in the book, and subsequently elsewhere, have answered: the size of the page is 9.3 of W.H. small text—*i.e.* each dislocated passage is found to be a multiple of that. Applying this test to vv.[31-36], and to vv.[14-21], we find a misfit. The passages do not answer the test.

F. Warburton Lewis.

Bolton.

Who was Nathanael?

In his well-known book, *The Fourth Gospel*, Professor E. F. Scott has the following sentence with reference to Nathanael: 'This mysterious disciple, who is nowhere mentioned in the Synoptic narratives, and whose call is yet described with peculiar fulness and solemnity, has always been one of the riddles of the book.' Almost all commentators recognize that such an impressive description of his call, linked with those of Andrew, Peter, and Philip, point to the inclusion of Nathanael among the apostolic Twelve.

The traditional view that Nathanael is another name for Bartholomew has been widely accepted. But why Bartholomew? Westcott gives the following reasons: (1) The mention of Nathanael in Jn $1^{45f.}$ and in 21^{2}, shows that he was prominent among the apostles. (2) There is no mention of Nathanael in the Synoptics, nor of Bartholomew in Jn. (3) Bartholomew is in form a patronymic, and the bearer of such a name would most likely have another name as well. (4) In the Synoptic lists of the apostles (Mt $10^{2f.}$, Mk $3^{17f.}$, Lk $6^{14f.}$), Bartholomew is the companion of Philip, who in John brings Nathanael to Jesus.

No one of these reasons is conclusive. The first two might apply equally well to any of the several apostles not mentioned in John. In the next place, the patronymic is expressed in these lists by the use of the Greek genitive, *e.g.*, ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου, ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, not by the use of the Aramaic בַּר, 'son of.' The name Bartholomew has lost its original patronymic sense as much as Barabbas and Barnabas.

The principal reason for the traditional view seems to be that, in the Synoptic lists, Bartholomew is grouped throughout with Philip. Reference to the text fails to bear this out. It *is* true of Matthew. In Mark and Luke, however, Bartholomew is connected as closely with the following Matthew as with the preceding Philip, while in Ac 1^{13} their names are not even in conjunction. On the other hand, Philip is connected as closely with Andrew in Mark, and with John in Luke, as he is with Bartholomew. This argument thus falls to the ground.

If Nathanael, then, is not certainly Bartholomew, who else may he be? The one name which stares us in the face from the context does not seem to have been suggested. When Jesus saw Nathanael coming to Him, He said (1^{47}), 'Behold, an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!' Nathanael's prompt rejoinder: 'Whence knowest thou me?' has always been a stumbling-block. To say the least, the taking for granted of such a designation is hardly in keeping with the humility of an ideal Israelite. It has often been noted that the story of Jacob is reflected in the language of this passage (Jn 1^{43-51}, especially in vv.[47. 51]). But, further, is not the point of the whole dialogue to be found in a word-play on the name 'Jacob,' or what is taken as its equivalent, 'Israel'? And 'Jacob,' of course, is the 'James' of E.V. It is surely as natural to suppose that our Lord knew the *name* of His prospective disciple, as that He knew his disposition. As the young man comes within earshot, Jesus exclaims: 'Behold, an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!' Nathanael, or James, is contrasted with his namesake the patriarch. It is at the mention of his name, or what he takes as a reference to it, that he is surprised. 'Whence knowest thou me?' he asks.

The interpretation suggested above requires, of course, that we read 'Israel' for 'Israelite.' If Professor Burney's hypothesis of an Aramaic origin for the Fourth Gospel be accepted, the difficulty is reduced to a minimum. In that case, the difference would be in a single *yodh*.

If Nathanael be James, can we say which James? As we place him among the Twelve, he must be either the son of Zebedee or the son of Alphæus. The prominence given him would tempt us to identify him with the former, were it not for Jn 21^{2}, where Nathanael *and* the sons of Zebedee are found together. Even that difficulty would not be found insuperable by some scholars. Accepting it, however, we are left to identify Nathanael with James the son of Alphæus.

The question remains as to why the disciple is in John called Nathanael, if his name was Jacob, or James. Surely it is to distinguish him from others of that name, no less than four of whom have been distinguished in the Gospels. There is James the brother of John, son of Zebedee; there are James the son of Alphæus; James the Lord's brother; James the son of Mary, and perhaps James the brother or father of Jude.

The possession of two names was, as we know, not uncommon. We have Simon Peter, Matthew or Levi, Saul called Paul, and others. What is more likely than that the later prominence of James the Lord's brother so overshadowed this earlier disciple, that by the time the Fourth Gospel was written, he had become more familiarly known by his other name, Nathanael?

R. B. Y. Scott.
Toronto.

Entre Nous.

Christ of the Indian Road.

In his preface to *The Christ of the Indian Road*, Dr. Stanley Jones says that the book is not 'An Indian Interpretation of Christ,' it is, rather, an attempt to describe how Christ is becoming naturalized upon the Indian Road. The book is not an Indian interpretation of Christ, partly because that is not its author's purpose, but partly because there is at present no Indian interpretation to give an account of. The Indian Christian has made no real contribution to Christian Theology because he has been trying to think through Western forms. But Dr. Jones believes that in the future, and perhaps in the near future, Indian Christianity will find its own forms, and the religious genius of India pour itself through Christian moulds. And not the least interesting part of this book is the forecast of the form which this Indian interpretation will take. There will be three notes in it, Dr. Jones believes. First, the followers of the Christ of the Indian Road 'will show us the real meaning of a *spiritual* life. They will sit lightly to earthly things and abandon themselves to the spirit.'

Along with that will come 'the sense of the unity and harmony running through things. "Don't you think atonement would mean attunement?" said a Hindu to me one day. He felt his life was "like sweet bells jangled out of tune" by sin and evil, and to his mind, craving inward peace and harmony, atonement would bring attunement to the nature of God—music instead of a discord. No wonder peace has been the great thought and craving of India. Anything like losing one's temper is thought to be utterly incompatible with the truly religious life. "I know I haven't salvation yet," said a villager to me one day, "for while I have conquered everything else anger still remains, I haven't got it yet." The followers of the Christ of the Indian Road will be harmonized and peaceful.' And the third note will be renunciation. 'The followers of the Christ of the Indian Road will know the meaning of the cross, for India stands for the cost of being religious. Renunciation will be a reality, for India instinctively grasps the meaning of Jesus when he says that the way to realize life is to renounce it—to lose it is to find it. In the footprints of many of his followers as they walk along the Indian Road will be blood-stains, for they will be Apostles of the Bleeding Feet.'

But we have diverged from Dr. Jones' main purpose, which is to describe how Christ is being naturalized upon the Indian Road. He believes that to-day there is a great movement towards Christ—a movement not only of the outcastes but of the intelligentsia. They are ready for Christ in spite of some stumbling-blocks. A Hindu teacher told him on one occasion that he wanted to become a Christian, '"but I do so in spite of the lives of the Europeans I have seen here. They seem to have two loathings, one is religion and the other is water." And he did not mean it for bathing, but for drinking purposes.' A great stumbling-block is race prejudice. On more than one occasion Dr. Jones had to make his own position clear with regard to the colour question before he could continue with his message, and on this point he makes a very piercing hit when he says, speaking of the planter in the Malay States, that his 'race prejudices do not extend as far as his lusts.'

But what India is ready for, Dr. Jones says, is

Christ, not Christianity, if by that is meant the system that has been built up in the West. And the work of the missionary is to 'introduce' Christ. I spoke to a Hindu student one night in the after-meeting of a series and asked him if he didn't want to know Christ. "Yes," he said, eagerly, "but I do not know how to go to him." I suggested that I should love to introduce him to my Master. I saw quite vaguely then what is clear to me now: my chief business and chief joy is to introduce men to this Christ of the Indian Road.

'If I do that, I must know him myself, and that means much.'

'A friend of mine was talking to a Brahman gentleman, when the Brahman turned to him and said, "I don't like the Christ of your creeds and the Christ of your churches." My friend quietly replied, "Then how would you like the Christ of the Indian Road?" The Brahman thought a moment, mentally picturing the Christ of the Indian Road—he saw him dressed in Sadhus' garments, seated by the wayside with the crowds about him, healing blind men who felt their way to him, putting his hands upon the heads of poor, unclean lepers who fell at his feet, announcing the good tidings of the Kingdom to stricken folks, staggering up a lone hill with a broken heart and dying upon a wayside cross for men, but rising triumphantly and walking on that road again. He suddenly turned to the friend and earnestly said, "I could love and follow the Christ of the Indian Road."

'How differs this Christ of the Indian Road from the Christ of the Galilæan Road? Not at all.'

The *Christ of the Indian Road* has already passed through six editions in America, and Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have now published the first English edition (3s. 6d. net). It cannot fail to be read with the greatest interest and profit. The author—Dr. Stanley Jones—is a missionary to India and a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Christ or—nothing.

'Mrs. Besant announces a coming World Teacher. She puts forth Krishnamurti, a Brahman youth who is to be the incarnation of Christ. (Even here she naïvely acknowledges the supremacy of Jesus, for it is to be an incarnation of *Christ*.) He has given forth his first instalment of world teaching, and has received divine honours in India and in the West. I had a long interview with him, found him of average intelligence, of rather lovable disposition, of mediocre spiritual intuitions, and heard him swear in good, round English! I came away feeling that if he is all we, as a race, have to look to in order to get out of the muddle we are in, then God pity us.

'There is literally no one else on the field and nothing else on the horizon. It is Christ or—nothing.'[1]

Necessities.

Week by week Dr. G. H. Morrison contributes a short homiletic or devotional study to 'The British Weekly.' These eagerly looked-for addresses have now been collected and published in book form, with the title *Highways of the Heart* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). The subject of one striking address is the unescapable elements of life 'approving ourselves . . . in necessities' (2 Co 6^4). Necessities in the idiom of the Greek does not connote necessary things. 'It means experiences from which is no escape. It is in such experiences Paul wants to be approven.' What, Dr. Morrison asks, are these unescapable elements of life? 'One thinks first of certain bitter things that reach men in the realm of mind or body.' 'There is blindness; there is lameness; there is deafness; there is congenital deformity of body. There are brains that never can be brilliant, and faces that never can be beautiful. There are thorns in the flesh, messengers of Satan, hindering influence and power and service, that are going to be present to the end.'

'Then one's thoughts go winging to temptation, for temptation is one of the "necessities" of life. Separate from each other in a thousand ways, we are all united in temptation. A man may escape the gnawing tooth of poverty, or the anguish and the languor of disease. He may escape imprisonments and stripes, and the "slings and arrows of outrageous fortune." But no man, be he wise or simple, rich as Crœsus or poor as Bartimæus, ever escapes the onset of temptation.'

'Another of the "necessities" of life is what our Saviour calls the cross. Just as in every lot there is a crook, so in every life there is a cross. You remember how our Lord declared this—"If *any man* will come after Me, let him take up his cross"—*not* certain men in strange peculiar circumstances, but *any man*, right to the end of time. From which we gather that in the eyes of Christ the cross was universal in experience, one of the things that

[1] E. Stanley Jones, *The Christ of the Indian Road*, 62.

nobody escapes. The cross is anything very hard to carry—anything that takes liberty from living—anything that robs the foot of fleetness, or silences the music of the heart. And men may be brave, and hide the cross away, and wreathe it with flowers so that none suspects it, but, says Jesus, it is always there. There are only two things men can do with crosses—they can take them up or they can kick against them. They can merge them in God's plan of life for them, or they can stumble over them towards the glen of weeping. And what could be finer, in the whole range of life, than just to determine, as the apostle did, to be divinely approven in the cross? '

The Riches of Poverty (Lk 21⁴).

'The words, "of her penury," carry a deeper suggestion than the mere fact of our poverty can convey. It was a gift out of penury that lit up the eyes of the Lord of Life when all else about Him spoke of darkness. It was a gift out of penury that made the handsome contributions of plutocracy to dwindle into the merest trifle. "For she of her penury hath cast in all the living that she had."

Nowhere does this sense of the unworthiness of what we have to give seize us with such paralysing effect as in the realm of prayer. We know what response we ought to make to the liberality of God's unshackled love. But we are poverty-stricken. And so we begin to wonder if prayers so thin and halting as ours are not an affront to both the majesty and the love of God.

'There is only one answer to such bleak misgiving. If such prayers are "all our living," if they represent the honest sum total of the best our soul has to give, then, in pouring them into the Lord's treasury, we bring joy to the Heart that loved us unto death. Prayer is not to be measured by calories of emotional heat; its value is not commensurate with its ease and fluency. As a cold climate produces a strong race, so coldness in prayer often preserves the soul from enervating self-deception, and forces it to strike deep roots into the eternal Rock. The loneliness and emptiness of soul that we often experience in the very act of prayer may be the hand of God, dilating the heart by hope deferred and unfulfilled desire, until it can receive the Presence it longs for. For most souls, prayer, if taken seriously, is a business demanding high courage. Napoleon used to say that he admired the man who possessed "two-o'clock-in-the-morning courage"—the courage that enabled him to face a long, rough march in cold and stormy dawnings. With some souls it is always "two o'clock in the morning." For them, prayer means facing bleak winds of discouragement and being numbed with the chill breath of spiritual winter-time. But if their "living" consist of the two mites of courage and generosity, their "all" will surely yield high usury in the exchequer of the Kingdom.' [1]

Countee Cullen.

SIMON THE CYRENIAN SPEAKS.

He never spoke a word to me,
  And yet He called my name;
He never gave a sign to me,
  And yet I knew and came.

At first I said, 'I will not bear
  His cross upon my back;
He only seeks to place it there
  Because my skin is black.'

But He was dying for a dream,
  And He was very meek,
And in His eyes there shone a gleam
  Men journey far to seek.

It was Himself my pity bought;
  I did for Christ alone
What all of Rome could not have wrought
  With bruise of lash or stone.

Do you know the author of this poem—Mr. Countee Cullen? Possibly not, for Mr. Cullen is still young. He was born in May 1903, and this poem is taken from his first published volume. Mr. Cullen calls his book *Color* (Harper Brothers; 6s.).

Yet do I marvel at this curious thing:
To make a poet black, and bid him sing!

[1] E. Herman, *The Touch of God*, 89.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is good for nations, as for individuals, sometimes to see themselves as others see them. The keenest critic of himself or of his country is apt to miss blemishes or at any rate peculiarities which are obvious enough to outsiders. Some years ago Professor Münsterberg, in a brilliant book, gave the Americans an opportunity to see themselves through German eyes, and this year Dr. Hermann Werdermann has furnished them with a similar opportunity in a more comprehensive and equally interesting book entitled *Das religiöse Angesicht Amerikas* (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh ; 8 Mk., geb. 10 Mk.).

The book is beautifully written, and the writer is equal to his task. He has obviously a complete command of the English, and even of the American language ; he is a careful, sympathetic, and impartial observer ; and he had opportunities of mingling with Americans of every type. More particularly was he interested, as the title of his book indicates, in the religious life of America. He knows books like Ralph Connor's 'Black Rock,' and he can quote the saying ascribed to Chalmers, that 'a house-going minister makes a church-going people.' The impressions of such a man were worth recording and are worth considering.

More than once he reminds us how difficult it is to estimate America, for there are so many Americas. There is East and West, there is North and South, there is Fundamentalist and Modernist, and within these broader divisions there are endless types. The visitor begins by being enthusiastic, continues by being doubtful, and ends by being cautious, or, it might be more correct to say, ends with an admiration tempered by severe but friendly criticism. It is always difficult to feel the pulse of another people, and the truth about religious America has been too frequently distorted, on the one hand by idealization, and on the other by caricature.

Religious life on its external side, he tells us, and Church services play an incomparably greater part in America than in Germany, and yet the churchless masses of America are more unchristian than the churchless masses of Germany, for in the latter country Bible instruction in the day schools and preparation for confirmation secure some definite acquaintance, however slight, with Christianity and its great Book, to a degree which is not possible in a country where the State takes no official cognizance of these things ; with the result that there are in America no less than thirty millions of people who belong to the denomination of 'modern heathendom'—people who are most of them not indeed hostile to the Church, but indifferent.

All the more does the voluntary organization of

American Church life, with its almost illimitable energy, rouse Dr. WERDERMANN's admiration. He is familiar with the envelope-system, and is struck by the abounding generosity of the gifts for home and foreign mission work; indeed, he says, an outsider may get the impression that the Church is little more than an organization to raise money, though this, he admits, would be anything but a just judgment.

Compared with the quiescent life of the average German congregation, American congregations—many of them—seem to be in perpetual motion, with their Brotherhoods, Ladies' Aid, Guilds of all sorts, Church Banquets, and outlets for activities, such as baseball and occasional dancing, whose intimate relation to religion is not exactly obvious to German eyes. The tremendous emphasis on social activities may constitute a weakness as well as a strength. The writer tells of a young German artist who complained that in the incessant din of the Church's social work, the gentle tones of religion were scarcely audible, and confessed that he would rather suffer bodily hunger in Germany than endure the hunger of the spirit to which American life exposed him. But it has to be remembered, as a young American lawyer acutely remarked, that America is not yet in the fullest sense a settled, but rather a wandering people; and nomads should not be expected to possess a developed sense for the deepest values of music, art, and, in general, of the world of spirit.

A really devout German is more devout than a devout American, and the ideal religious type would be one which would blend the profound and wistful quality of the one with the social energy of the other. For if the American pulpit is too much concerned with social applications of Christianity, and too little impressed by the majesty of God and the beauty of other-worldliness, the estrangement of the masses from the Churches in Germany may be due, at least in part, to the more meagre insistence on the social aspect of Christianity. The American preacher, with social interests ever before him, is much less likely to be guilty of the unpardonable sin of tedium: he is interesting and alive. Laymen are attracted, not only into hearing but into definite service: the interest of the layman in the Church and her work is a feature which calls forth WERDERMANN's unstinted admiration, and a feature which he would give much to capture for the German Church. And with this goes the relative friendliness, rising not infrequently to enthusiasm, of the working classes for the Church, in sorrowful contrast to the indifference and alienation of many at least of those classes in Germany.

The preacher in America is very close to life, partly because his college curriculum keeps him definitely in touch with the problems he will later have to face in the city or the country. It aims at equipping him for his ultimate work as pastor, whereas the tendency, if not the aim, of the German theological course is to produce the scientific theologian. To a German the training at an average American seminary seems rather superficial on the scientific side, but the German system pays for its greater depth by a more slender emphasis on the purely pastoral side of the minister's calling, and on the necessity of encouraging the religious life of its theological students. WERDERMANN pays a glowing tribute to the warmer atmosphere of piety that characterizes the American college, and explains its more definitely religious and practical quality by the fact that American professors are nearly always drawn from the ranks of the pastorate, and so have a first-hand knowledge of the work their students will ultimately have to do.

But he does not disguise the fact that the preparation is often very inadequate. He quotes Dr. Cadman, who was asked, 'What is the chief weakness of the Protestant clergy?' as replying, 'Only thirty-three per cent. have received sufficient education for the job.' In preaching, this inadequacy later appears as a love for the topical in preference to the expository sermon, a preference which some-

times expresses itself in themes of varying degrees of monstrosity, such as, 'Is kissing sin?' 'Why do women powder?' though WERDERMANN admits that it would be unfair to regard these as typical. The inadequacy frequently appears in the formlessness of the service: except in the Episcopal churches, there is little sense of liturgical dignity. The writer speaks of seeing a preacher appear in his pulpit with a coloured tie and brown shoes, and of another, at a communion service, sandwiching the announcements between the invitation hymn and the distribution of the elements.

For good and evil, America is practical. An American evangelist will drive home his truth by improbable and even humorous stories—a practice which naturally offends his sober German critic. And the children are as quick-witted in their practical applications as their teachers and preachers. One class, when asked to repeat 'in American terms of to-day' the story of the good Samaritan, promptly substituted the preacher for the priest, and the negro for the Samaritan! This practical quality can be a menace not only to liturgical decency, but to true religion, when it is used to stimulate a narrow patriotism. WERDERMANN relates, incredible as it may seem, that at a gathering of youth, after the reading of Isaiah 40, a hymn was announced and lustily sung, of which the refrain was, 'For army and navy for ever, three cheers for the red, white, and blue.' It is only fair to add that many Americans would deprecate this as energetically as any German could.

This long book of three hundred and twenty-five pages is of profound interest and value not only to Germans but to ourselves. On its better side, the American pulpit, as WERDERMANN justly remarks, has been deeply influenced by England and even more by Scotland, the books of whose preachers and scholars are to be found in many an American study. It will be a great day for the Church in every land when in her pulpits stand men who, to the theological interests inspired by European scholarship, add the warm, eager, practical temper of America.

The record of religious experience has always a peculiar fascination, even though it be crude, or abnormal, or pathological. But when it is the experience of one who, with religious fervour and the mystic's vision, unites a balanced judgment and a cultivated mind, open and hospitable to all new truth, then the record becomes of the highest moral and religious value. Such a record will be found in *The Capacity for God*, by the Rev. R. F. HORTON, D.D. (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). Dr. HORTON, in Browning's words, has 'lived, seen God's hand through a lifetime, and all is for best,' and he has written to guide others to the same happy experience. 'In looking back over the seventy years of my life, I find the one unmistakable and persistent factor in it has been the presence of God. There have been no miracles in my life; only it has itself been a miracle. I have had few extraordinary experiences; but the experience as a whole has been such as fills me with wonder. I cherish the belief that most people have had my experience, or something like it. I am almost sure that every one might have it, and was even meant to have it.'

The book is by no means wholly, or even mainly, biographical. Its main purpose is to discover the supreme regulative principle of all right living, 'the Master Faculty' as Dr. HORTON prefers to call it, and to get at the secret of using it. Is 'the Master Faculty Reason? The thought of our day says No. Reason is regulative, but the life-force in us acts before Reason comes into play, and our personality as it develops is greater than Reason. The very definition of it, even the description of it, far more the possibilities of it, tax Reason far beyond its powers. The Master Faculty within us is that which puts us into relation with the Power that conceived and made us, and with the Purpose for which we exist. Reason leaves us very uncertain about the Power and the Purpose. . . .

Meantime there are many, how many we never know, who are in contact with the Power and know the Purpose. These are the saving elements in human life. Thanks to these and their unconscious agreement, the march of humanity continues and is not lost in the waste.'

What, then, is the Master Faculty? The answer is, Faith. And what is Faith? Not a mental assent to a proposition or a theory, but an act of the whole personality. Faith is above all a deed, a strenuous, resolute deed, a great and courageous venture—the venture upon God. In the original constitution of our being we have a sense of God. We feel, dimly enough perhaps, that though there is no form nor voice He is there, and though there is no physical compulsion or direction He guides, cares, works for the best. Faith means to act on that assumption, to treat the assumption as fact, and to rely on it. 'Faith is the fling of the soul on the Unseen Power from whom the soul came. A life of faith is the habitual exercise of that Faculty, the ever surer and more convinced reliance on the Power not ourselves, a Power that works in us, not only to do, but to will.'

It may be defined by contrast to Self-reliance. 'A fine word, and suggesting a needed precept, so long as it is understood to be reliance on one's self as against dependence on others. But it is not a fine word, nor does it suggest a wise precept, if it means reliance on one's self instead of dependence on the Power not ourselves. Indeed, though for a moment of exuberant youth and health, a man may seem to himself sufficient to himself, it is only for a moment, and almost immediately his own boast mocks him. . . . Verily man at his best estate is altogether vanity. And if his reliance is on himself alone, he is a pitiable little creature, ridiculous to his fellows, and more ridiculous to the higher powers of the universe. One thing alone redeems him: he can fling himself on the Unseen Power, and trust Him, he can lose himself in the Oversoul, he can become the conscious and grateful organ of that larger life, the instrument and mouthpiece of the Being who made him, and made him for Himself.' That fling of the soul on the Unseen God is justified and more and more approved, till it becomes a certainty, the surest certainty in the range of human experience.

There is, however, a great danger of isolating this Master faculty from other energies of the mind and heart, of regarding it as a heaven-born power working in some altogether supernatural way, independent of our personality and daily life. No error could be more disastrous. God dwells in us and works through us, not by setting aside or overruling our natural faculties, but by using them. The reason, the will, the imagination, the æsthetic or artistic side of our nature, are all to be developed to the utmost limit of their capacity, and through their highest use God speaks and works. Dr. Horton illustrates this by his own experience as a minister. 'I gave myself to a constant and purposeful study, mainly of the Scriptures, but also of other books, history, philosophy, social science, and poetry. And, to avoid the dangers of the study and the student, I got into touch, by systematic visiting, with my people. It was a life of unremitting toil. I felt that I was not my own. I knew that I must live wholly to receive and to utter the word of God. . . . Very soon I noticed that, in the careful and systematic study of the Bible, subjects would start up with such vividness, such irrepressible insistence, that it seemed necessary to preach on them at once. . . . Subjects were always there, the only embarrassment was to know which to select for each occasion. But as time went on I observed that the selection also came to me. Circumstances, or the experiences of life, or some particular demand, showed clearly that this subject must be taken. . . . Sometimes I could have answered the question why I took that subject, sometimes I could not. But again and again I found that there were people in the congregation who were startled by the fact that the subject was just what they needed. . . . I began to recognise that my mind was directed by Another, that I was a mouthpiece, a little more than a

mouthpiece perhaps, a mind seeking to be used by the exercise of all its faculties to gather what God was saying and to utter it, and yet, strictly speaking, a mouthpiece.'

The message of the book, and the summing up of the writer's life experience, is a word of hope, a real evangel. 'This is the one thing we absolutely know about the Unseen Power, that it responds to our absolute trust, and proves to be personal in the sense that a person comes into direct relation with it.' 'Into the mighty current of the Infinite, which is love, as well as wisdom and power, everyone can, if he will, push his tiny bark, and be borne along sweetly and securely to the murmuring sea.'

Why has the Fundamentalist position so strong a hold on America, not to speak of our own country? Some time ago Professor Bacon assured us it was because 'Liberal' Christianity had so thin a gospel, and people were concerned at the prospect of losing any definite Divine remedy for human ills. Dr. Richard Roberts has a different explanation, which he gives at large in the current *Hibbert Journal* in an article on 'The Theological Dilemma in America.' When everything has been said that may fairly be said of the ignorance and prejudice upon which the fundamentalist propaganda feeds, and when the controversy has been stripped of its extravagances (there have been extravagances on both sides), we shall find, he thinks, that behind it all is a dilemma that holds most of our minds 'both religious and liberal' (that is rather a nasty knock at liberalism!)

The bugbear of the fundamentalist is evolution. And it is so because evolution implies a change in our conception of God. Creation implies a transcendent God; evolution, an immanent God. Creation recognizes a God standing outside the universe, having brought it into being by His *fiat*, and operating on it from without in perfect freedom according to His own will. And if evolution does not actually imply immanence, at least the two ideas make good company in the mind. Now much follows from that. The God of Christian theology is purely transcendent, and to come to terms with evolution is to repudiate the faith once delivered to the saints. For a theology of transcendence cannot be reconciled with a theology of immanence. Evangelical liberals are in this matter inconsistent. They adhere to traditional forms and read into them an immanental content. This makes their defence against fundamentalist attack seem very feeble.

The fact is the evangelical liberal is in a cleft stick. Indeed, cleft sticks seem to Dr. Roberts to be flying all around. First the liberal is in one. His religious experience and his intelligence are at odds. His religious experience gives him a God who is transcendent. His intelligence forbids him to deny the Divine immanence. The Incarnation implies a stark transcendence, God coming down from His throne, and excludes every view of Him coming up 'from the ranks.' An Act of Incarnation cannot be dressed up as a Process of evolution.

But there is a cleft stick for the philosopher too. He tries to reconcile the Absolute with a universe in process. It is actually (though Dr. Roberts does not say so) the very same dilemma. Indeed, wherever you look you see the same two sides of a shield. Take St. Paul, for example. From his Judaism he inherited a transcendent God, and from this derives a theology of 'transactions,' of which the great terms are Justification, Redemption, Adoption, Propitiation, Reconciliation, all representing things done upon man or for man by a God acting from without. But St. Paul also had a theology of immanence, the heart of which is the conception of the indwelling Christ. This is an organic theology. And the point of interest (and Dr. Roberts admits it) is that Paul felt no incongruity between the two strains. They were both real to him, and both real at all times.

47,403

Now the conclusion of all this is surely obvious. This same duality is present and persistent wherever reflective men speak out of their religious experience. It may therefore fairly be surmised that 'the duality springs from two necessary aspects of a living religious experience, which are both real, but which cannot be intellectually formulated without logical contradiction.'

Is there any hope of a synthesis? Not at present. We must be satisfied with a provisional dualism. This will require us to hold two theologies at the same time—the substance of the traditional theology of the Church and the nascent theology of Immanence. 'For my own part I will continue to affirm the main theses of a "transcendence" theology—Inspiration, Revelaton, Incarnation, Redemption, Grace. But I propose to hold also the main theses of an "immanence" theology—the inborn and indwelling Christ, the "new man," the kingdom of God as the purpose and goal of the evolutionary process. I propose to be both a traditionalist and a modernist, in the belief that a frank dualism is a healthier state of mind than a premature and muddled synthesis.' That is a quite good confession of faith. But it rather takes the wind out of some of his previous statements.

It may be true, as Dr. ROBERTS says, that the fundamentalist is inspired by a fear of losing the older conception of God out of which all his theology of redemption comes. (This explanation is rather like Professor Bacon's after all.) But it may be permissible to express a doubt as to the soundness of many of Dr. Roberts's generalizations. Why, for example, should the conception of evolution exclude transcendence? No one is more of a monist or a believer in naturalism than Professor Lloyd Morgan, and yet he believes that the natural process is the expression of a Divine Purpose, and purpose is a conception of transcendence. Any action on a thing implies transcendence. No doubt the traditional thought of God was too exclusively transcendent, but there is no necessary contradiction between a God who does things and a God who expresses Himself in a process.

St. Paul was sounder than Dr. ROBERTS in his unconsciousness of any contradiction between the two elements in his experience, and one ought not to forget that all thought and all experience are beset by antinomies that seem to contradict each other and yet are both known to be true. Foreordination and Freewill are one, the Absolute and the Fluent are another. Probably all these are forms of one antinomy, and this problem of Transcendence and Immanence is but another instance of the one eternal problem. It is solved, however, in experience, as all the rest are. No fault is to be found therefore with Dr. ROBERTS's conclusion. It is in the picture of the situation he is inclined to over-statement or to unguarded statement. There are many 'evangelical liberals' who would warmly repudiate the statement that the Incarnation implies stark transcendence alone, for whom indeed evolution has thrown a fresh light on the Incarnation as the expression in human form of the Divine immanent Purpose of love. Dr. ROBERTS has, however, done a service in calling attention to elements in the thought or instinct of Fundamentalism for which a large place must be found in any reconciliation of divergent tendencies.

Greek and the Gospels.

By Professor Hubert Pernot, The Sorbonne, Paris.

The author of this article warns the readers that they will find many paradoxes in it. His excuse is, that, for him, they express the truth. He will try to justify his meaning, as far as this is possible in a short article, and if he does not succeed in making all his readers share his convictions, he will at any rate have directed the attention of the public towards some points of the Gospel problem which have not hitherto, according to him, been sufficiently brought to light.

Every one knows that our Gospels were originally written in Greek. What is Greek? Most people would answer: a dead language. This idea is erroneous, and has had disastrous consequences for the study and comprehension of the Gospels. As a matter of fact, the Greek language has been spoken and written without interruption for nearly three thousand years. From Homer to the present day, it is an uninterrupted linguistic succession. Foreign conquerors—Romans, Slavs, Franks, Turks—have occupied Hellas without causing the language to disappear, without even leaving a lasting impression behind them, and certainly without modifying it in its essentials, without taking from it its true Hellenic character. Modern Greek is the normal outcome of this evolution.

Modern Greek is extremely conservative. It still has four cases: nominative, vocative, genitive, and accusative. Only the dative has disappeared, The word ἄνθρωπος is declined thus: ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἄνθρωπε, τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τὸν ἄνθρωπο, οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ἄνθρωποι, τῶν ἀνθρώπων, τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. *I see the daylight* is, in modern Greek, βλέπω τὸ φῶς τῆς ἡμέρας. One would search in vain, through all the modern languages, for an instance of such durable and perfect stability.

Besides the oral tradition, a more learned one has been handed down to us. Most of the newspapers and books edited in Athens are written, not in the language the Greeks speak, but in a language much nearer to the ancient Greek and accessible to any Hellenist after a few hours' study. But a number of contemporary writers, thinking that a double language is pernicious to the growth of a nation, endeavour to write in the spoken language. The result is what is called 'the linguistic question.' It is extremely complex, because in practice these two languages cannot clearly be opposed to one another. They often are blended in different measure, according to social standards and circumstances.

Every Greek who has attended the primary school is able to read and understand the Gospels. An illiterate countryman only understands part of them, but in order to make them intelligible to him, a simple transposition, rather than a real translation, is needed. The Greek of the Gospels is nearer to spoken Greek than Montaigne's French to modern French; perhaps we might also add as a comparison, nearer than Shakespeare's comedies to modern English. One day I happened to count up the number of words of Mark's Gospel not to be found in Vlachos's *Modern Greek-French Dictionary*. There are about seventy. This dictionary contains the forms both of the written and the spoken language. The difference would, of course, be more considerable if only the latter were concerned, but even then the comparison would still be striking.

It is remarkable that the scholars who have studied the Gospels have taken as a rule very little notice of modern Greek. It may be due to the fact that the Occidental Neo-Hellenists have not yet brought forward enough the importance of this matter. However, they have not omitted it altogether. But their remarks have had a limited range. What interested them most was the question whether some form was to be considered as a Hebraism or as belonging to the normal evolution of the Greek language. The religious side of the problem prevented the linguists from approaching it as a whole; the theologians took little interest in what they considered accessory. Two methods, the one exegetical and the other philological, are confronted and have after all only a few common points. Enlightenment could have come from the East, but the Athenian linguists, although they pointed out the importance of the New Testament for the history of modern Greek, stood prudently on the reserve, for the same reason. As for the Greek exegetes, walled in by a long ecclesiastical tradition, and being by no means

philologists, the whole matter escaped their attention. For them, the Gospels remained above all liturgic books.

It is not to be wondered at, that, under these circumstances, the number of professional Hellenists who have studied the Gospels with a view to translating or commenting upon them, should be so small. Those to whom this task has been left are mostly priests or ministers, who certainly prepared for it as best they could, and whose efforts it would be unfair to disregard, but who necessarily lacked certain special knowledge. However strange it may seem, the one Greek text which has the greatest importance for mankind is one which, as far as Greek is concerned, has been studied the least seriously.

This fault was balanced in a way by the number of these workers—each one profiting by his predecessors' observations—and especially by the existence of the Latin translation of the Gospels, written in the fourth century by St. Jerome, and known as the *Vulgate*. The author used several more ancient translations. His is extraordinarily literal. For each Greek word he finds a Latin copy, even if it has a different meaning: λέγω ὅτι becomes *dico quoniam* or *dico quia*. This method has advantages, but there are also drawbacks. Of course the translation remains very near to the Greek text, which thus sometimes becomes clearer, but, on the other hand, it frequently leaves obscurities. It often happens that an expression only becomes intelligible in Latin when one thinks of the different meanings it can have in Greek. Ἵνα, for instance, is translated by *ut*, but that does not imply that the Greek word should mean 'so that,' like the Latin *ut*. Very often the Vulgate has thus caused mistranslations which would probably have been avoided by professional Hellenists translating directly from the Greek. I will give a few instances of this: Mt 3^{11} gives οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι, Vulg. *cujus non sum dignus calceamenta ejus portare*. At this point I should like to make a general remark concerning the whole of this article. There is probably no one who can say that he has seen all the translations of the Gospels. Several times I happened to discover in one of them or in a commentary a meaning I thought was new. Since I have drawn the attention of the French public towards this passage, some translators may have altered the usual interpretation. However, the word is habitually translated *bear*. It is a strange idea. As a matter of fact, this verb ought to have had the meaning it has with several Greek authors (Atheneus), as in Jn 20^{15}, 'whose shoes I am not worthy to take off.' Cf. Jn 12^{6}, where the same verb probably means, as with Polybius, 'steal.' Matthew's text means the same as Mk 1^{7}. They only differ in a matter of style.

Mk 3^{4}: ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι ἢ κακοποιῆσαι, ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἢ ἀποκτεῖναι; is translated: 'is it lawful to do good on the sabbath days, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill?' If the reader will think about it, he will see that it is pure nonsense. It ought to be read: 'is it lawful to do good on the sabbath days, *rather than* to do evil? to save life, *rather than* to let perish?'

The same happens with the well-known passage (Mk $4^{11.12}$): 'unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all these things are done in parables: *that* seeing they may see, and not perceive . . .' All those who are familiar with the New Testament exegesis know what discussions have arisen about this passage. The Vulgate, translating ἵνα by *ut*, helped to spread the error. Now ἵνα here does not mean 'so that,' but *because*. The grammarians of the second century often enough attested this meaning. It is to be found in Epictetus and elsewhere (cf. Liddell & Scott's *Dictionary*). E. A. Sophocles pointed it out in his *Greek Lexicon*, edited in New York, and there are other instances of it in the New Testament. It seems, however, to have escaped the attention of translators and exegetes. Led astray by the classic meaning of ἵνα, and also by the corresponding passage in Isaiah, they neglected the enormous difference between the text of the Septuagint, the whole of which was quoted by Matthew, and the Hebraic text. Without any doubt whatever, ἵνα in this passage, is to be translated by *because*, and the meaning is, 'for those who are without' (*i.e.* those who remained in the street, for the crowd), all these things are done in parables, because they are looking and do not see, listening and do not hear, lest they should be converted and their sins should be forgiven them. That is to say, their hearts are hardened, as it is said in Mt 13^{15}, they will not be converted; they lack faith, do not understand at once the mystery of the Kingdom of God; that is why I have to use figurative speech. Cf. Mk $4^{33.34}$: 'and with many such

parables spake he the word unto them, *as they were able to hear it,* but without a parable spake he not unto them, but when they were alone he expounded all things to his disciples.' If this explanation is not yet considered satisfactory, the reader may look up the synoptical passage, Mt 13^{13}, where ἵνα is expressed by διὰ τοῦτο . . . ὅτι 'because.' Once more, the two Evangelists agree.

One could multiply these instances. It is not rash to say that if profane texts, studied by professional Hellenists, had been concerned, these errors would either not have been made, or not have subsisted so long.

It is remarkable that, more than once, the authors of Greek dictionaries, confiding in translators and without daring to judge by themselves—the subject appeared to them too difficult for that—should have inserted in their books errors of the kind we have just mentioned.

However, we must go back to Byzantine and modern, much more than to ancient Greek, where the Greek of the New Testament, and especially of the Gospels, is concerned. Twelve years ago I wrote that the Gospels are our first texts in modern Greek; my researches since that time have only confirmed my opinion. The explanation is not so easy to make for the readers of this magazine, many of whom are probably unacquainted with modern Greek. I shall give a few examples, however, before approaching the point I consider the most important about the Gospel problem.

Lk 14^{23} gives ἔξελθε εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς καὶ φραγμοὺς καὶ ἀνάγκασον εἰσελθεῖν, ἵνα γεμισθῇ μου ὁ οἶκος, Vulg. *compelle intrare.* I believe D. C. Hesseling, Professor of Modern Greek at Leyden University, is the first to have pointed out, that ἀναγκάζω sometimes occurs in Byzantine texts with the meaning of 'to incite, to invite'; cf. Mk 6^{45}, Mt 14^{22}. This is interesting when one remembers the interpretation given to the passage.

Jn 10^{24}: ἕως πότε τὴν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν αἴρεις; It is understood: 'How long dost thou make us to doubt?' Pallis, in a modern Greek translation edited in Liverpool, and to which sufficient attention has perhaps not yet been paid, translates this sentence by ὡς πότε μᾶς βγάζεις τὴν ψυχή. The verb αἴρω is often in modern Greek, βγάζω= ἐκβάλλω. It is a familiar and everyday expression meaning: 'How long will you bother us like this?'

Mk 14^{65}: καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἔλαβον. For a long time, this expression was treated with suspicion. It was also thought to be the Latin *verberibus accipere.* The scholars greeted as a wonderful discovery an equivalent expression κονδύλοις (αὐτὸν) ἔλαβεν found in a papyrus of the first century. They would have been spared much trouble had they turned towards present-day Greek. Greek peasants usually say 'take somebody by the blows, by the stick' for 'to box his ears, to beat him.' It was at that time, and still is, a common expression.

As for Mt 5^{22}, one can only understand μωρέ, and consequently the whole passage, if one remembers that the vocative is still used at the present time as a familiar or slightly contemptuous expression. One hears it in Greece every moment.

Let us go back to ἵνα. This conjunction, in modern Greek, has become very important, under the form νά. Followed by the subjunctive, it has the same value as the infinitive. It can also denote the imperative, the future, and perhaps there is not one of these meanings which cannot be found in the Gospels, especially in John. I hope soon to examine this essential matter in detail.

When one reads Jn $17^{1.2}$, one finds: Πάτερ, ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα· δόξασόν σου τὸν Υἱόν, ἵνα ὁ Υἱὸς δοξάσῃ σε, καθὼς ἔδωκας αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν πάσης σαρκός, ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ δώσῃ αὐτοῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. These ἵνα's are usually translated 'so that,' and the passage runs: 'Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee: as thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.' I believe this is nonsense. Now, in a popular tale edited several times, the last being in the *Chrestomathie néo-hellénique,* by Hesseling and Pernot (Paris, 1925), a young girl says to her father (p. 130, l. 8 ff.): Πατέρα, βοήθα με, νὰ σὲ βοηθῶ, νὰ περπατοῦμε πιὸ γρήγορα, 'Father, help me, that I help you (*i.e.* and I will help you), that we go (*i.e.* and we will go) faster.' In this tale, it is an allegorical sentence. The girl always speaks in comparisons, and becomes, through this peculiarity, the wife of the Prince who meets her. What she means here is: 'Father, speak to me, and I will speak to you, and thus the way shall seem shorter to us.' This use of ἵνα is most ordinary nowadays and the examples are numerous. For instance, in a popular song we find: φάτε καὶ πιέτε, βρέ (another form of μωρέ) παιδιά, χαρῆτε νὰ χαροῦμε, 'eat and drink, fellows, enjoy yourselves that we enjoy ourselves (*i.e.* and

we also will enjoy ourselves).' These two quotations help us to understand the passage from John: 'Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, and thy Son shall also glorify thee. Thou hast given him power over all flesh [=over every creature], he shall give eternal life to all thou hast given him.'

The exegetes have been discussing for centuries about Mk 2^{10}: ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ, translated, 'but that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, he saith to the sick of the palsy.' Are the words, 'he saith to the sick of the palsy,' to be attributed to Jesus or to Mark? If to the former, the sentence is not satisfactory. If to the latter, there is a strong anacoluthon. But if that is the case, how is it that Mt 9^{6} and Lk 5^{24} give exactly the same sentence? It is to be questioned whether one should read here εἰδῆτε or ἴδητε. I am rather inclined to admit the second hypothesis. Whatever the truth may be about this special point, I believe we see here another use of ἵνα, well known to all those who have studied modern Greek a little: 'well, you will realize (or see) that the Son of man has power on earth to forgive sins (since he is going to do the more difficult task of the two).' The sentence stops there, it is complete. Mark then takes up the rest of his narrative: 'he saith to the sick of the palsy.'

I could give any number of examples. A Hellenist would discover scores, no, hundreds of mistranslations in our present-day renderings of the New Testament. Some are not very important, but others are very serious.

I have already referred to the 'linguistic question,' the γλωσσικὸ ζήτημα. It is as old as Hellenism itself. Never do the Greeks seem to have been troubled by the differences between their literary and their spoken language. As far back as antiquity, literary dialects belonged to a different sphere from the spoken ones. It depended on the kind of work it was, more than on the country or on the author. Hesiod, although a Beotian, wrote in the language used in the Homeric poems, and, in the second century, Oppianus uses the same in his *Poem on Fishing*. The question was not less vital in the first few centuries after Christ than it is now. The school of the Atticists recognized the use of the Greek language as it was spoken in Athens under Pericles, and the authors of the New Testament did not in the least lack interest in this quarrel.

Mark was a simple man who wrote almost, not quite, as he spoke. Matthew seems to have been more learned. He was very strict where doctrine was concerned, but with regard to the language he rather kept to the golden mean. Luke shows more scholastic influence. He aims at what was then considered correct and elegant, and he resolutely puts aside those forms of his predecessors which he thinks too vulgar. John does not seem to trouble much about these grammatical matters. He sometimes uses rather learned verb forms, but on many points his syntax is more popular than Mark's. He is the only Evangelist who writes popular words like ψωμίον (modern Greek ψωμί), 'bread'; ἀρνίον (modern Greek ἀρνί), 'lamb'; ὀψάριον (modern Greek ψάρι), 'fish'; he makes a distinction between fish in general (ἰχθύς) and fish served on the table (ὀψάριον). When we get to the Epistles, the language becomes more affected and differs more from spoken Greek.

Some of these facts have already been noticed, but the whole of them does not seem to have been brought to light sufficiently. Most of our translations do not make these differences of language apparent, and are monotonous and uniform. On the other hand, it often happened that a pompous and bombastic style was given to passages which in the original text are simplicity itself, and in which vulgarity is by no means avoided but on the contrary intended. Besides, the exegetes have not yet fully realized the importance that discoveries of this kind have for the synoptic problem.

I believe we can accept as a principle that not one author would have thought of modifying at that time an older text to make it more common or, as they used to say then, more incorrect. It is only much later that such facts appear in the history of the Greek language. They are easily explained. Some works written in ancient or very learned Greek were no longer accessible to the public, so versions were made in spoken Greek which are real translations. Nothing of the kind happened for the New Testament, and especially the Gospels. If Mark writes such simple Greek, it is almost certainly because his learning does not allow him to go any further.

Let us now take a passage common to both Mark and Matthew, but showing differences of style, as, for instance, Mk 1^{7}: οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς

κύψας λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ= Mt 3^{11}: οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι. Either these passages depend on one another, or they go back to a common origin. In the first case it is hardly likely that Mark should depend on Matthew. One, ten, twenty passages of this kind would not give one a certainty. But when one sees the same proceeding running through the whole of the two Gospels, one cannot doubt any longer. Admitting the first hypothesis, we know it was Matthew who had access to Mark's text, and who modified it. Is it possible that, for passages of this kind, they may have had a common Hebraic or Greek source which each of them altered according to his own habits of language and style? I do not think that the hypothesis of a common Hebraic source is compatible with the two texts as they exist, but to discuss the details a whole book would be needed. As for the Greek source, if one admits its existence one must also admit that in passages of this kind it was, except for a few points, identical with the text of Mark we possess now. That is only putting the problem further back; besides, it is not very likely. Many critics admit nowadays that Matthew depends on Mark. Arguments taken from the language confirm this opinion.

As far as Luke is concerned the question has been much more adversely discussed. The same method will, I believe, allow us to say that Luke had access to Mark's text when he wrote his Gospel —and I will even add that he also had Matthew's, a fact very few critics admit at the present time. It would take me too long to discuss this point of view, but I shall give two instances, so as to show the readers what the principle of the method is.

I will not choose the first on purpose to suit my theory, I shall simply take the same as before:

Mk $1^{7.8}$.	Mt 3^{11}.	Lk 3^{16}.
	ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν·	ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς·
ἔρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου ὀπίσω μου,	ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μού ἐστιν,	ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου
οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς κύψας λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ· ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι,	οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι·	οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ·
αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.	αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί.	αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί.

In this passage Luke's version is simply a mixture of Mark and Matthew. He suppressed Matthew's εἰς μετάνοιαν because he did not think it a good addition to Mark's text. Matthew probably hesitated over Mark's vulgar expression: 'of whom I am not worthy to unloosen the latchet of his shoes'; therefore τὰ ὑποδήματα αὐτοῦ βαστάσαι. But why has not Luke, who usually avoids vulgarisms, rather followed Matthew than Mark in this case? Partly because he disliked βαστάσαι in the meaning of 'to take off.' Like Matthew he considers that κύψας is an unnecessary word, a fault in style, and consequently he suppresses it.

The second example will be the well-known sentence ὕπαγε Σατανᾶ, 'get thee hence, Satan,' which is to be found in Mt 4^{10}, but which Luke does not give in the synoptical passage. This difference has been explained in many ways. Did these words figure in the source Q, which many of the critics admit for Matthew and Luke? Did Matthew add them to the source? Did Luke suppress them? It seemed impossible to find any definite means of bridging the difficulty. Once more linguistic arguments can solve it. We are still examining Greek grammar. Luke uses different forms of the verb ὑπάγω, 'to go,' the imperative plural ὑπάγετε, 'go,' but never the imperative singular ὕπαγε. Each of the eight times when he finds this imperative in Mark and Matthew, he replaces it either by a synonym or by a word having quite a different meaning, or else he suppresses it. When one is used to his way of writing, the idea which immediately strikes one is, ὕπαγε must have had a vulgar meaning. It is not due to chance that the two instances of this form given by our lexicons should be taken, one from Euripides' *Cyclops*, the other from Aristophanes' *Nubes*. Another imperative, very near to the former, ἄπαγε, was taken up by the Latin as an interjection: apage! The form ὕπαγε, accepted without hesitation by Mark

and Matthew, seemed to Luke a vulgar word which he could not allow to pass the lips of Jesus. So he suppressed it in Matthew's text. I shall not examine here the other alterations he made in the temptations, as his predecessor had given them, and I shall only refer the reader to the article I wrote on the subject in the *Proceedings of the Amsterdam Academy*, 1924, div. Letterkunde, part 57, series A n°=5). The suppression of ὕπαγε indicates that Luke used Matthew, but I believe this fact is also made clear by the way he treated the whole passage.

The more I study the Synoptics, the more I am convinced that many of their differences can be explained by literary or grammatical arguments. It happens often enough that linguistics show harmony between the Synoptics where hitherto discord had been seen. But the striking point about it all is that every Evangelist used the text of his predecessor or predecessors very freely. This statement will, no doubt, upset many ideas, but one fact is certain: if there are books about which the truth may not be hidden, whatever the consequences may be, it is most decidedly the Gospels.

Literature.

MR. MIDDLETON MURRY'S LIFE OF JESUS.

The worst way to estimate such a book as Mr. Murry has written—*The Life of Jesus* (Cape; 10s. 6d. net)—is to lay down a 'Catholic' standard and weigh this 'life' by that. More than with most books, we need to bring sympathy and understanding if we are to appreciate the new interpretation of Jesus. Mr. Murry is one of the foremost literary critics of to-day. It is a surprise (though why should it be?) to find a man of his prepossessions dealing with the greatest of all problems: Who was Jesus Christ? He tells us why he has done so. 'I do not propose to offer an apology for this book. I wrote it because I needed to write it. The time had come when it had become urgent upon me to make up my mind about Jesus. For reasons which concern myself alone I desired, if I could, to make him wholly *real* to myself. The Jesus who is presented in these pages is simply the Jesus who is real to me—the Jesus in whose real existence I can, and in whom I do, *believe*.' Who could read sentences like these without sympathy? Here is a literary critic of uncommon ability and insight who confesses that he *must* come to a decision about Jesus. No one could go very far with such an inquirer without feeling that, whether the interpretation is right or wrong, at least he will have the company of an earnest, lofty, and deeply religious spirit.

Mr. Murry naïvely claims that his training as a literary critic may be the equivalent of the more specialized training of the professor of divinity. We are afraid there is good evidence in the book that this claim is not wholly justified! But this training has at least had one good result in this connexion. It has shown him the arbitrariness of a certain type of 'advanced' criticism of the Gospels. It 'repels me as a man, and irritates me as a critic.' Indeed, one of the features of the 'Life' is the persistent effort of the writer to keep as close as possible to the narrative as we have it. When there is miracle, indeed, like the feeding of the five thousand, he skilfully and gracefully eludes it. He does not believe in miracle in the ordinary sense. He thinks Jesus' repudiation of it at His Temptation means that He never worked or professed to work miracles. The writer's training as a literary critic doubtless enables him to follow faithfully the narrative of the evangelists while quietly eliminating the miraculous. His method is ingenious but far from persuasive. At the same time Mr. Murry frankly asserts that Jesus had powers and wrought deeds which 'it would tax modern medical science either to deny or to explain.'

It would be easy to lay one's finger on mistakes, or on views which will not easily be accepted. It is difficult to imagine how, for example, Mr. Murry reached the extraordinary conviction that Jesus arranged with Judas for His arrest. Again, the writer in concluding his chapter on the Temptation says that the spirit of evil 'left him and never

returned.' Yet nothing is more certain in the Gospel story than that the Temptation of the wilderness was repeated again and again. When Peter made the same suggestion as the Satan of the Temptation, Jesus turned on him, and said, 'Get thee behind me, *Satan*.' And it was the identical suggestion with which Jesus struggled in Gethsemane. Again, where does Mr. Murry get his amazing idea that Jesus did not expect death, but hoped at the last moment before death to be translated to a great destiny? It is an idea that seems to be purely subjective and arbitrary. Still further, the writer greatly exaggerates the motive of fear in Jesus' mind, if indeed the feeling was there at all. Jesus is represented as always on the alert to flee from Galilee because of the Pharisees and of Herod's supposed threat to kill Him. 'The boat' being in readiness for Him, His sudden journeys outside Galilee, these and much else are taken as evidence of a condition of constant apprehension. But the situation as represented is purely imaginary. A much simpler explanation is the usual one that Jesus escaped from the crowds because He wished leisure to train His disciples, which was the preoccupation of His later time and the grand necessity for the future of His cause. The greatest of all Mr. Murry's mistakes, however, is to represent Jesus as a sinner. The author thinks that Jesus admitted as much by coming to John's baptism. The accepted explanation of that incident he does not refer to at all, namely, that Jesus did at the outset what He was to do at all times later, identify Himself with His brethren. Jesus gives an explanation Himself which covers this: 'Come now,' He said in answer to John's protest, 'this is how we should fulfil all our duty to God' (Moffatt's translation). But, indeed, any supposed implied confession of sin on Jesus' part is against all we know of Him and His mind and His claims and the witness of His closest friends.

But it is a somewhat thankless task to point out defects like these in a book whose merits are evident. We are grateful for the book for one thing beyond others, because of its profound appreciation of the greatness of Jesus. Mr. Murry believes Jesus to be not only a son of God like us, but a unique Son, an 'only son.' He does not use the 'Catholic' terms, and would repudiate them. But he holds the substance which they represent. After all, it is difficult to put into words our sense of the supremacy of Jesus. Catholic experience and theology have tried to do this in the traditional doctrinal terms. Mr. Murry has as real and profound and reverent an attitude to Jesus as any Catholic believer, though he would not use traditional terms. There are few orthodox believers who have a more passionate enthusiasm for Jesus than this writer; therefore any and all of his errors of judgment are easily forgotten in the light of his attitude to Jesus, 'for he loved much.'

The central point of Mr. Murry's view of Jesus is as interesting as anything he has to say. Jesus, he thinks, did not believe Himself to be Messiah at first. It was only after Cæsarea Philippi that the conviction came to Him, not that He *was* Messiah, but that He *would be* Messiah after His translation. For Messiah was not a mere man, but a great Heavenly Figure like that in Daniel's vision. Jesus therefore believed that He would come back to 'restore all things' as this Divine being. He was to *become* Messiah. And this was a development of His later ministry. For this He must endure the Cross, and therefore Jesus was not only a great teacher and prophet, the greatest of all, but one who died for His truth. And that is why His teaching is not to be found only in His words, but in His life and death. His triumphant ministry was to be after death in His heavenly transfiguration and return. It was a mistake, but it was heroic. This theory is a *tour de force*. It will not gain any wide acceptance. It is an eccentricity of criticism. But what of that? The real value of this book lies not in a particular interpretation of Jesus, but in the picture it gives us of one who, at all points sharing our experience, lived the greatest of all lives and achieved something that can only be called Divine. Mr. Murry has given this vision of Jesus unforgettable expression, and his 'Life' of Jesus will be received with feelings of profound gratitude for its picture of Jesus as one reverent man has seen Him.

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND CRITICISM.

Professor J. E. McFadyen of Glasgow has done something in his new book, *The Approach to the Old Testament* (James Clarke; 6s. net), which needed to be done. He has come to grips with the 'Fundamentalist' position, meeting its arguments patiently and candidly, examining its contentions in the light of plain facts, and putting the case wisely and fairly and with good temper for criticism

and its broad conclusions. No one alive probably is more competent for this special task. Dr. McFadyen is a profound and accurate Old Testament scholar. He can put a case with simplicity and force, and even when he is dealing with truculence and ignorant insolence he can be fair and moderate. His book is a piece of controversy, done in a most Christian spirit. But it is far more. It is animated by a deep love and admiration for the Old Testament literature, and a reverent appreciation of its inspiration and spiritual authority, and we cannot read far in his book without receiving an impression of the greatness and sublimity of these ancient oracles. There are five chapters: on Verbal Inspiration, on The Moral Difficulties of the Old Testament, on The Neglect of the Bible, on The Conservative Defence, and on The Critical Reconstruction. What emerges from these chapters is a new understanding of the Old Testament as the record of a progressive revelation. Dr. McFadyen gives us a point of view from which the 'difficulties' of the Old Testament simply disappear. He carries the war into the 'enemy' camp, when he shows that the conception of the Bible held by fundamentalists is one potent cause of the neglect of the Book. And finally he shows us in a masterly sketch what the history and literature are like, and what the religion of the Old Testament is, when the books are dated and arranged according to the assured conclusions of criticism. This is a book for the disturbed and perplexed, for the inquirer, and for every one who wishes to know what the worth of the Old Testament is and how a Christian faith is to be held along with a frank acceptance of the critical standpoint.

THE WESTMINSTER MARK

The Westminster Commentaries have been rendered distinguished by Driver's fine book on Genesis. But the most recent of the series challenges even Driver by its excellence. Indeed, it would be hard to imagine a more satisfying guide to the Second Gospel. The student who knows no Greek could well dispense with all other commentaries and content himself with this one. For one thing, the introduction is the most complete and competent handling of all the questions needing to be treated that we know. Mr. Rawlinson knows all the literature and has weighed all the arguments, and if we do not agree with all his conclusions, he gives us material on which we may differ intelligently. He has also the gift of putting his points in a most interesting fashion. All the questions of date, authorship, relation to other Gospels and the rest are examined fully. In addition we have fascinating chapters on the supernatural element in the Gospel, on the theology of the Gospel and on its religious value. The writer vindicates convincingly the historical value of Mark, though in our opinion he entirely underrates the dependence of Mark on Peter. He comes to the same conclusion as Mr. Middleton Murry, that there is no chronological scheme of Jesus' ministry possible. The stories are accounts of sporadic happenings, mostly undatable. We are not convinced by the reasons given, but the point is both interesting and important. The date Mr. Rawlinson fixes as 65–67 A.D. He holds that Mark is not a translation of an Aramaic original, that there was no '*Ur Marcus*,' that Mark used 'Q' as well as other sources, that it is not 'Pauline,' and that it is not so much a biography as a Gospel in the strict sense. Some of these conclusions are open to question. But they are presented in a series of studies that have filled us with admiration. The commentary proper is of quite unusual value. It not only explains difficulties, but it expounds and discusses all the points we want to know about. We have used the commentary as it will be used by preachers and students, and we can only say that it is a book to make the real student of the Bible grateful. The title is *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, with Introduction, Commentary, and Additional Notes, by the Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, B.D. (Methuen; 16s. net).

DR. GEORGE A. GORDON.

Dr. George A. Gordon has been minister of the Old South Church, Boston, for over forty years, but in his autobiography he is not so much concerned with these years as with the early ones. The title of the autobiography is *My Education and Religion* (Allen & Unwin; 16s. net). It is an autobiography full of leisure and contemplation. Dr. Gordon enjoys looking back. He was born in Scotland in 1853, of good stock. He says of his grandfather 'that he was a God-fearing man and therefore made free of any other fear.' Existence in those days was a sterner business than it is now.

When he was seven and his oldest brother eleven, they were despatched to a new school. 'Father handed a letter for my brother to give to the master. We wondered what was inside that letter, and my brother proposed that we open and read it, and I assented. The letter read: "Dear Mr. Dunn, I am sending my boys to your excellent school. They are very wild boys. Will you be especially severe with them?" My brother made the suggestion, to which again I assented, that we take a stone out of the fence on the turnpike road and put the letter in there and then place the stone back again, which we did. Father never got any answer to his letter.' And if existence was stern it was matched with a stern faith. 'I remember well,' he says, 'putting this question to my earliest and best teacher, my pious, beautiful mother, "If I should try all my life to be good, do you think that I should get into heaven?" "No; not if Predestination is against you; many are called, but few are chosen." I put the question again, "If I should try with all my might, all my life, to do my duty in the love of God, do you think that I should get into heaven?" "No; many are called, but few are chosen; unless you are elected, there is no hope."' Another illuminating little story is on the independence of that day. When he was about twelve he went to visit his paternal grandfather. After bidding me welcome he asked me how much my fare on the train had cost me. I had walked six miles to the train; I had ridden by train ten miles, and I had walked four more from the station to my grandfather's farm, all of which had to be done again that day on returning home. My fare was eighteen cents. My grandfather brought me a shilling, twenty-five cents, from his slender store, put it in my hand, saying that he wanted no one to be at any expense coming to see him. This extreme independence makes credible the story of the two Highlanders lost in their small boat in a fog off the west coast of Scotland. One watched, at the same time steering the boat, while the other prayed thus: "O Lord, bring us to land and we will be greatly beholden to you"—"Stop, Donald," cried his friend, "I see the land, let us not be beholden to anybody."'

THE AO NAGAS.

The Assam Government must be a progressive body. They encourage their officials to make intensive and sympathetic studies of the natives, and have the books published under their direction. And right good books they are. The Ao Nagas are a small people about thirty thousand in number. Yet recently three interesting studies of them have seen the light: one by an American missionary, one by a Hindu Medical Officer, and one by an English resident Government official. Each of them treats the subject from a different angle, and none is more important or so full as *The Ao Nagas*, by Mr. J. P. Mills, M.A., Indian Civil Service (Macmillan; 30s. net). This is a very sound bit of work. The book, of some four hundred and fifty pages, has a fullness of knowledge that shows everywhere, and deals with almost every conceivable aspect of the people's life and thought—from strange myths as to the origin of the various tribes, among which one comes upon an interesting variant of Gideon's test, a chieftain selecting for an adventure only such as crammed the boiling, bubbling fat into their mouths; or folk-tales like that of the people with ears so large that they use one as a mattress and the other as a blanket; or that of the battle between fire and water, in which the former fled and hid in stones and wood, but was seen by the grasshopper; on through the details of daily life (one comes on a type of bullying exactly as described in 'Tom Brown's Schooldays'), and a long chapter on the language, and an account of the odd wars with almost no casualties (war was learned at the start from watching the ferocity of an ant), and eerie facts about medicine-men which leave one a little shuddery, and the practices and hopes of their religion, and so to the weird burial rites, and thoughts of the beyond. As one approaches the Judge yonder, the evil things in one's bundle of deeds keep rising to the surface and lie there staringly, pack them deep down how you will. If your head was taken in war, you have to hang about the earth till your conqueror dies, and then follow him as his slave. If you maltreat your dog, a day comes when you reach a world where the dog is the master, and you are the dog! Finally, one fades out. Woman is in no whit the inferior of man, and at the village council, though not on it, has an official representative to state things from the woman's point of view.

It is interesting that both Professor W. C. Smith, an ex-missionary, and Mr. Mills have a chapter on the results of civilization, and especially the Christian

faith, impinging on this people. Both are broad-minded and religious men, and it is a little disquieting that both feel the results are somewhat mixed. For his part, Mr. Mills thinks that on the debit side has to be set a loss of humour, a trace of immorality due to the educated Christians having little to do, and evil results from the American Baptists' insistence upon absolute prohibition, which, he says, has caused not a few of these people to take to worse things, opium and horrible concoctions.

HISTORY AND REVELATION.

Professor W. G. Jordan, D.D., of Kingston, Canada, known as one of the most convincing exponents of modern criticism and one of the most living interpreters of the Old Testament, has just published through Messrs. James Clarke & Co. a volume entitled *History and Revelation* (6s. net). The book is in reality, as its sub-title indicates, a discussion of 'The Individuality of Israel.' It does not distress Professor Jordan that totemism and ancestor-worship may have left traces, more or less clear, upon Israel's religion, nor that that religion was affected by the religions of other peoples with whom she came into contact: throughout all her experience she developed and maintained an individuality of her own.

In several informing chapters Dr. Jordan illustrates the nature of those alien religions, notably those of Babylon and Egypt, and in particular of Ikhnaton, the heretic king; but 'Israel did, in its specific sphere, achieve an independent life which Egypt and Babylon did not create and could not destroy,' with the result that 'the more clearly we recognize the poverty of Israel in the world's science and art'—and a special chapter is devoted to Religion and Art in Israel—'the more do we see its unique spiritual power.' This spiritual power appears at its highest in the prophet, who is 'Israel's true glory.' Whenever Dr. Jordan has occasion to touch on the prophets, he writes with an insight and enthusiasm which recall his early volume on 'Prophetic Ideas and Ideals.' To him prophecy is the heart of the Old Testament, and its spirit is evidenced in the historians and in the Psalter, as well as in the prophetic movement proper, of which he gives a masterly sketch. 'The prophet did not make his appeal to miracles, but he is himself a miracle,' and the time did not produce him.

It was the power of religion in Israel that created interest in history, and that interest manifests itself as reverence for the past and as confident hope in the future. All this is convincingly set forth with a refreshing absence of wearisome detail and illustrated by ample quotations from modern scholars. The book traverses many subjects, such as inspiration, revelation, morality, and politics, in a way well calculated to carry the conviction of Israel's unique place in history. It is the work of a sagacious mind, with a profound appreciation of Israel's noble literature and its invaluable contribution to the higher life of the world.

CLEOPATRA'S NEEDLES.

The accomplished and indefatigable Sir E. A. Wallis Budge, who combines the wide and accurate knowledge of the scholar with the power to interest the ordinary man in the result of his learned researches, has in his latest volume, bearing the above title (R.T.S.; 10s. 6d. net), enhanced our debt to him as an interpreter of ancient Egypt. The volume was written to replace the book on 'Cleopatra's Needle' written by the Rev. James King and published forty-two years ago. In an interesting introduction on The Egyptian Obelisk, Dr. Budge raises the question how the two obelisks of Thothmes III., which had been transported to Alexandria by Augustus, and which by the Arabs were known as Pharaoh's Big Needles, came to be called Cleopatra's needles, and answers it by suggesting that 'the vulgar were unable to associate the idea of big needles with Pharaoh, thinking that they ought to be the property of a queen rather than of a king.' The next chapter is a fascinating account, interesting alike to historians and engineers, of how Cleopatra's needle came to London, and of its re-erection on the Thames Embankment. This, however, does not exhaust the interest of the book. Much the larger part of it is occupied with illustrated descriptions of all the important obelisks of Egypt, and even of monolithic monuments in Abyssinia. These descriptions are accompanied by the hieroglyphic and other texts, with an English translation. Earlier writers, such as Pliny and Ammianus, regarded obelisks as monuments erected by the Pharaohs to commemorate their victories, and failed to grasp their religious symbolism and character; for these great temple obelisks were

rected to the glory of the Sun-god, and were urned into monuments of the triumphs of the haraohs by the inscriptions cut upon them. The ook, abounding in illustrations and hieroglyphics, uns to two hundred and eighty-seven pages. How t can be produced for 10s. 6d. must remain a narvel.

ALFRED BERTRAND.

The Religious Tract Society has done a real ervice to the cause of Christian missions in publishng the biography of *Alfred Bertrand, Explorer and Captain of Cavalry* (10s. 6d. net). The title is not he best that might have been chosen for this ccount—written by his wife—of a most interestng personality, a native of Geneva, of Huguenot escent, whose zeal in the cause of Christian ission work, especially in Zambesian South frica, became the mainspring of the latter part of is life. In his youth he entered into the dangerous nheritance of a fortune and position which enabled im to gratify his inclinations as sportsman, ountaineer, traveller, and explorer. He became n enthusiastic and most efficient Swiss cavalry fficer, and in later life, when he appeared on any latform either in this country or abroad to plead he cause of Christian missions, his striking appearance, soldierly simplicity and directness of speech, nd his genial but earnest manner made him a most ffective speaker.

Writing just as a traveller in China who had visited some of the missions in passing, he testifies: 'What strikes one at once is the difference between the Christian Chinese and their heathen fellow-citizens, their pleasant expression, their cleanliness; in short, the complete transformation of the former. What fine and courageous men are these missionaries, and what a life of devotion is theirs!' In India he writes: 'I have often remarked the great difference which exists between the natives of different countries who are not Christians and those who have been converted.' Similarly, when he visits London and sees something of the Salvation Army work: 'What a peaceful expression on the faces of these Salvationists! That is what struck me above all.' Likewise at the Charrington Mission in the East End of London: 'The thing that strikes me especially about this crowd is the quietude, and even seriousness, that prevails.' This is the man whose life was changed by an expedition he made to the then little known region of the Upper Zambesi, where he found the devoted French missionary, M. Coillard, carrying on his notable work. 'The results obtained by this handful of Europeans inspired by the Spirit are astonishing. Before their arrival this country could justly be called a land of blood.' Of Basutoland, which he visited later, he exclaims: 'To think that their near ancestors were heathen. . . . What a mighty transformation! How Christianity elevates and ennobles the human being!' This volume is a wonderful testimony by a man of remarkable gifts.

Personality and Immortality in Post-Kantian Thought, by the Rev. Ernest G. Braham, B.A. (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net), is the work of a serious and competent student of philosophy. The first part gives a critical account of personality and immortality in the works of McTaggart, Bradley, and Bosanquet, together with an exposition of the reaction against Hegelianism in the works of Lotze, James, and Ward. This survey is admirably clear and concise. The second part offers a constructive view of the origin, nature, and destiny of personality. One could have wished that it had been fuller, for the writer sets forth his views with great persuasiveness. His general position may be gathered from the following sentences: 'Believing that reality is an ordered system, and that what is known as material and psychical are in no sense different in ultimate nature, I have ventured to claim that personality starts with the rudimentary feelings of the organism in its pre-natal condition, developing in complexity and unity as a system of experiences. The binding or unifying principle in the universe I hold to be God, the Dominant Monad, whose immanent and transcendent activities cause every new "emergent" in the evolutionary process, and cause the appearance of personality, as well as conserving it, not only throughout its earthly course, but also during its eternal development "yonder." Believing that the nature of the Infinite Being is Love, I incline to the view that all souls live eternally, and that however far they may have wandered from this Love by aberrations of conduct and unrighteousness of thought and desire, the something good that remains in the most wicked, being influenced by the Love

" that will not let us go," guarantees that all souls will return to that loving fellowship with God.' The reasoning is persuasive, though one may doubt how far the conclusions of logic are valid in these high regions.

'Barabbas was a publisher' is the old jibe attributed to the unsuccessful author. As a matter of fact, it is remarkable to think of the peculiarly friendly and ultimately affectionate relations that have existed between a number of the most noted authors and their publishers. Generations have passed since the patron of the poor man of letters disappeared and the publisher became the real friend of the author, as in the familiar cases of Charlotte Brontë and George Eliot. Here is a publisher, Mr. Stanley Unwin (a member of the well-known house—George Allen & Unwin Ltd.), who has come into the field with *The Truth about Publishing* (7s. 6d. net). It is dedicated 'To those of my fellow-publishers who believe in co-operation,' that is between author and publisher. Mr. Unwin has no need to apologize for being greatly daring. The publisher's task, he says, is no simple one. It is vastly more complicated than it was even a generation ago. He takes the reader by the arm as it were and tries to show him all that happens behind the scenes when an author's MS.—a first or a twenty-first—is going through the ordeal of a preliminary 'reading.' The story is so well told that the ordinary reader will be as keenly interested as the would-be author with a most precious first MS. in the pocket. There are many surprises in store for both of them. 'Fewer duds and more best-sellers' is supposed to be the morning and evening prayer of the publisher, but Mr. Unwin puts in an aside to the effect that it is not usually the best novels which are most wanted by the public. Could anything be more encouraging to budding talent? That more and better books are not read is due to the lack of early training and the lack of guidance. What will book readers think of Mr. Unwin's avowal that 'many books are too cheap and leave no adequate margin for author and publisher,' and that 'in publishing as in other walks of life the best and therefore the more costly is usually the cheapest in the long run.' One had noted many other interesting *obiter dicta* on the varied interests of author, publisher, bookseller, and reader, but it must suffice to say that we have in Mr. Unwin a very frank and entertaining guide, philosopher, and publisher.

Eden and Cedar Paul have gained some reputation as translators. They have now turned their attention to *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* by Karl Marx (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d. net). Marxist students have for some time been wanting a new translation of this object-lesson in the Marxist interpretation of history.

There are more people who can read the Bible in Latin than in Hebrew or even in Greek. Partly for this reason and partly because of the profound influence exercised by the Vulgate on the English of A.V., it was altogether fitting that the Clarendon Press should publish *A Grammar of the Vulgate* (6s. net), written in collaboration by the Rev. W. E. Plater, M.A., and the Rev. H. J. White, D.D. Most things that the student of the Vulgate requires to know will be found here. Peculiarities both of words and constructions are noted and amply illustrated from every part of the Bible, including of course the Apocrypha. Much of this part of the discussion helps us to understand grammatical constructions of modern languages dependent upon Latin. To many students the most useful part of the book will be the sections devoted to Greek and Hebrew. A singular verb after a neuter plural (*e.g.* Jn 9^3, 'ut manifestetur opera Dei') would puzzle one who knew no Greek; while the fem. in Ps 27^4, '*unam* petii a Domino, *hanc* requiram,' or such a construction as 'adposuerunt adhuc peccare' for 'they sinned yet more' (Ps 78^{18}), would sorely puzzle one who knew no Hebrew. The resolution and illustration of these and other difficulties will be a great boon to the student who knows no foreign language but Latin.

The Law of the Lord's Day in the Celtic Church, by Professor Donald Maclean, D.D. (T. & T. Clark; 4s. net), is a translation of a Gaelic tract known as the *Cáin Domnaig*, with an accompanying dissertation on the attitude of the Celtic Church to the observance of the Lord's Day. Dr. Maclean has done his work with great care and considerable erudition. His conclusion is that the strict Sabbatarianism of Scotland is derived, not from the Puritans, but from the old Celtic Church. This conclusion may readily be accepted when one

remembers how large a strain of asceticism runs through the whole of the mediæval period.

The success of modern missions is marked by the fact that Christian missions rank to-day as a world force of the first magnitude. The man in the pew is only beginning, dimly if at all, to be aware of this, but diplomats, statesmen, and educationalists in all lands have to reckon with it. The Church also is gradually awakening to the greatness of her task, and the pressing need there is for the conservation of all her forces if that task is to be accomplished. The Rev. Robert Speer, D.D., LL.D., is a missionary statesman of international repute, and in *The Church and Missions*, published in the 'Living Church' Series (James Clarke; 3s. net), he has given an interesting survey of the whole field. It is in no sense a history of missions. It deals rather with the numerous and intricate problems which have been found to arise, such as missionary aims and policies, the influence, for good and evil, of political affiliations, the relation of the missionary to the native churches, the work remaining to be done, etc. The book gives weighty evidence of the inestimable good that missions have wrought, and it powerfully vindicates missionary methods. It is popular in style and ought to be widely read.

It is not an easy thing to speak to boys and girls, but the minister of Albany in Western Australia—Mr. Alexander Crow—can do it. Turn to Virginibus Puerisque and read 'Kookaburra.' Mr. Crow would be interesting, whatever his subject, but he has the advantage of having Australian lore about Birds, Animals, Bush Life, and Life on the Gold Fields at his command, and he makes right good use of it in his children's addresses. A number of these have been collected and published with the title *Gum Leaves* (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net). One of the chapters is 'A Lesson from a Camel.' There are many things not to be learned from the Camel, Mr. Crow says, but three things we can safely follow him in. 'He kneels in the morning to have the load put on. He kneels during the day to have it put right. He kneels in the evening to have it taken off.' Should we not 'take our load from God in the morning. Have it put right by God when things go wrong during the day. Have it taken off by God at night. Take it kneeling. Get it put right kneeling. Have it taken off kneeling. "Morning and evening and at noon will I pray."' If you have an interest in children's sermons you will add *Gum Leaves* to your library.

In warmly commending *Addresses to Mothers*, by Mrs. E. M. Field (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net), one cannot do better than quote from the Foreword by the Bishop of Sheffield. He claims for these addresses three outstanding merits. 'They deal with "first things," the elementary things of life, the home, the family, and the children, without a knowledge of which all other knowledge is of very little use. They are eminently readable, lit up by excellent stories and illustrations, and they are up-to-date in their recommendations of all the various new methods and new organizations which in these latter days have been created to help and teach Mothercraft.' It only remains to add that this estimate is entirely just.

Christ, Sin, and Redemption, by Professor D. R. Scott, M.A., Ph.D. (James Clarke; 6s. net), is a solid and valuable piece of work. The treatment of these great themes, if not profound, is marked by singular clearness and straightforwardness. The book consists of two parts. The first is expository and aims at elucidating what our Lord Himself and His two great disciples, Paul and the writer of the Fourth Gospel, mean by Redemption. The second part deals with Sin, Repentance, and Forgiveness (what might be called the Psychology of Redemption), the place of Christ and of the Church in the redemptive process, and finally the conception of God that issues out of the individual and communal experience of Redemption. The writer keeps in close contact with moral and spiritual realities throughout, his illustrations are telling, and his expositions are first-rate preaching material.

A delightful volume of stories of Cornish Methodism has been published under the title of *The Ship where Christ was Captain*, by the Rev. Mark Guy Pearse (Epwórth Press; 3s. 6d. net). They are reprinted from 'The Methodist Recorder,' but they will be welcomed far beyond Methodist circles. Here we meet again with the inimitable Billy Bray, with Samuel Drew and many others of like spirit, whose shrewd wits, and happy hearts, and souls aflame with Christian love made Cornish Methodism the living thing it was and is. The writer's name

is, in itself, a guarantee of good things, and the book is both a rich storehouse of racy anecdote and a sparkling well of spiritual refreshment.

The Moultons, four generations of whom were in the ministry of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, are a fine illustration of a true apostolic succession. Though in *Richard Green Moulton, LL.D., Ph.D.* (Epworth Press; 5s. net), this succession was not maintained in form, yet in fact in the man and his remarkable career we have all the outstanding characteristics of this notable family. This is not a biography of the ordinary type, but a brief memoir into which his nephew, Mr. W. Fiddian Moulton, has been singularly successful in compressing the events of fifty years of extraordinary activity, first in England as a University Extension Lecturer and later as Professor of Literary Theory and Interpretation in the University of Chicago. On the completion of a distinguished career as a student at Cambridge University in the early seventies of last century young Moulton was wondering how he was to shape his career. At that time a University in England meant either Oxford or Cambridge. Then came the idea of supplying the literary and scientific societies and Mechanics' Institutes with lecturers from either of the two Universities. At the same time the North of England Council for promoting the Higher Education of Women was doing its best to procure lectures for women in Manchester, Liverpool, Sheffield, and Leeds. The movement brought forth the man, and the man was Moulton. Another Professor writes of him: 'His lectures were unlike those of any one else. It is surely a real mark of genius to do what many others do, better than any one else and in a manner different from any one else.' His nephew claims for him that he was a pioneer in the field of popularizing the study of Literature, and more particularly the literary study of the Bible, which forms the subject of his most popular published works. What he succeeded in doing in England he carried out with even more conspicuous popularity in America. 'There have been many lecturers, but only one Moulton, and I hardly think there will be another,' writes one who felt the inspiring influence of his teaching.

The Bishop of London is conscious that he is not allowing the grass to grow in Fulham Palace yard. In the preface to *The Sword of Goliath* (Wells Gardner; 3s. 6d. net), he begins with the exclamation—'What! Another mission book by the Bishop of London!' His excuse is that 'tied and bound by countless duties at home, it is my only way of reaching souls all over the world.' It is not so long ago since a protest was made against certain Christian preachers that they never preached Christ. The Bishop of London emphasizes the fact that 'there is only one way in which the world call can be met, and that is by a real and hearty belief in the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.' This is his 'Sword of Goliath' for the present day. The Bishop knows from experience in the London parks, face to face with a miscellaneous audience chiefly of non-churchgoers, what it means to meet the questions of the man in the crowd.

From the same publishers we have the gospel of Jesus Christ presented in a different form in a volume entitled *Love: The Religion of the Future*, by Mr. Henry B. Young, M.A. (5s. net). Why the religion of the future, seeing that the most impressive sentence in New Testament Scripture consists of the three words 'God is love'? But Mr. Young states the case for the re-union of Christendom, including the Roman Catholic Church, with real ability and in a manner likely to grip the attention of his readers and cause them to question themselves as to how far they agree with him or disagree, and why.

The Rev. Walter A. Mursell is an accomplished journalist—we use this word in its best connotation—and he has a keen sense of humour. There are few subjects on which he cannot write in an easy and pleasant way. He has just published a new volume of essays with the title *The Bishop's Boots*, and it is delightful to read in it his thoughts on 'On Going Back,' 'A Country Cottage,' 'The Valley of Humiliation,' 'Celebrity,' 'Sympathy with Nature,' and many other topics. The volume is published by Messrs. Gay & Hancock, and they issue also, uniform with it, a second edition of his *Byways in Bookland: Confessions and Digressions* (5s. net each).

The third volume of *The Hebrew Union College Annual* (Cincinnati) is dedicated to the memory of Dr. Kaufmann Kohler, whose picture adorns the frontispiece. It is made up of a series of learned essays on widely different topics by very competent

and sometimes eminent Jewish scholars. Among the subjects treated are 'The term Foreigner (נכרי) historically considered,' 'Musical Instruments in O.T.,' 'Early Christian Archæology from the Jewish Point of View,' 'A Didactic Poem by Sahlal b. Netanel Gaon,' 'The Jews in Egypt and in Palestine under the Fāṭimid Caliphs,' 'The Correspondence between the Rabbis of Southern France and Maimonides about Astrology,' 'Two Letters from Abraham Firkovich,' 'The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel,' etc.

One of the most curious essays is on 'The Rewarding and Punishing of Animals and Inanimate Objects,' by Aptowitzer, of Vienna. There were those, it seems, who held that the killing of a flea or of a louse should render a requital on the part of God necessary, and likewise, that if an innocent mouse is torn to pieces by a cat or a sparrow-hawk, the Divine wisdom has decreed this fate for the mouse, and God will therefore grant it requital in the other life. Students of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament will be interested in a brief paper by Joseph Reider, suggesting emendations chiefly of passages in the Book of Job and mostly resting on Arabic analogy. For the difficult הדורים in Is 45^2, for example, is suggested חדורים from the Arabic root *ḥdr*, 'to go down' and 'to swell,' which yields a noun meaning 'slope,' 'declivity.'

It will be remembered that when Professor Moffatt made the announcement that 'The Expositor' must come to an end he promised us *The Expositor's Year Book*. That promise has now been fulfilled. The publishers are Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton, and the price 10s. 6d. net. The Year Book gives an account of the work which has been done in theology during the past year, especially in the departments of Biblical exposition and interpretation. Are there omissions? The work would not be human if there were not, but the reader may rest assured that he will find an amazingly comprehensive survey in this volume. The first chapter is an attractive item, although it may not perhaps be strictly germane to the main idea. Dr. Moffatt's illustrations in 'The Expositor,' taken from literature and bearing on the text of First Corinthians, will be remembered. He carries out the same idea here, only confining his sources to books published during 1925, but dealing with all the Books of the Bible. About fourteen pages are occupied by this. The survey proper occupies the remainder of the book and is made under the following heads—Magazine Articles, Inspiration and the Bible, The Old Testament, The New Testament, Religion — Primitive and Comparative, Apologetics and the Philosophy of Religion, The Psychology of Religion, Mysticism, Science and Religion, Dogmatic Theology, Worship and the Sacraments, The Church and Church Life, Applied Christianity and Christian Ethics, Devotional and Expository Literature. Dr. Moffatt has been assisted by Canon G. H. Box, D.D., Professor William Fulton, D.D., and Professor T. H. Robinson, D.D. The method adopted is to give, in addition to a catalogue of works, a survey of what has been done in each particular branch during the year, and then to indicate the argument of the more important books. This is a work of reference for which a place on our shelves should be found.

Let us take two volumes of sermons together. They are issued by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton. The first volume is *Watching the Cross*, by the Rev. J. D. Jones, D.D., Minister of the Richmond Hill Congregational Church, Bournemouth (7s. 6d. net), and the second, *The Gospel of the Larger World*, by the Rev. F. W. Norwood, D.D., Minister of the City Temple (6s. net). Both volumes of sermons are characteristic of their authors, and both will find a way made for them. In 'The Christian Year' last month we quoted, in a somewhat abridged form, Dr. Jones's address on 'Incarnation and Human Life.' He deals in this volume, as always, with the central themes of the faith. The two addresses preceding the one on Incarnation are 'Christ as God's Image' and 'The Man' on the text in Jn 19^5, 'And Pilate saith unto them, Behold, the man.' Dr. Jones considers this text under three heads—'*The* Man,' 'A Man amongst Men,' and 'A Man above Men.' It is an address which is perhaps more characteristic than that on the Incarnation, for it shows to perfection the clearness and simplicity of Dr. Jones's style.

Dr. Norwood's message is a stirring one, and it is delivered in phrases that grip the reader's mind. The titles of the chapters are arresting, even somewhat sensational at times—'The White-haired Christ,' 'The Right to Become,' 'What does God do?' 'A Thousand Years from Now,' 'The Illusion of Arithmetic.' Dr. Norwood makes Christianity very real. His message is in the first place a social one. Social wrongs he feels with intensity. 'I

believe,' he says, 'in social reform. I believe in just and wise legislation. I believe in the ferment of agitation, and resent not even its strident tones. I am consecrated, as every clear-eyed Christian must be, to the loosening of the fingers of a soulless commercialism until a hungry naked man in the midst is more terrible and disturbing than an army with banners on the borders of the land. . . . Had I a second life to dispose of, it should be given not to the preaching of the gospel, but to legislating it into existence. And my blessing goes with every man, for what it is worth, who takes the macadamized road of social reform while I pursue the bridle-track of the prophets to the City of God.'

A second edition of *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, by Professor Adolf Deissmann, has just been published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (7s. 6d. net). There is no substantial change in the book, and it embodies the Lectures which were delivered at the Selly Oak Colleges in 1923 on 'The Communion of Jesus with God' and 'The Communion of Paul with Christ.'

A volume of sermons from Mr. Yates is long overdue. The fact that he has just left Kensington, after twenty-one years there, and has gone to be colleague to Dr. Jones at Bournemouth, gives him the opportunity of dedicating *The Strategies of Grace* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net) to the members of the Church at Kensington. It is a volume of powerful preaching, rich in thought. The Sermon, which we have given—in an abridged form—for the First Sunday after Christmas, is by Mr. Yates.

Dr. Archibald Chisholm will be remembered as the author of 'Labour's Magna Charta' and so he is entitled to an attentive hearing from us when he tries in *High Roads and Cross Roads* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net) to indicate 'some of the implications of loyalty to Christ in the ordinary affairs of life.' The addresses are on practical subjects such as Wealth, Sport, Books, and A New Beginning. Our attention is being drawn more and more in the recent books to these practical subjects. Last month we quoted from Mr. R. W. Allen on 'The Use and Misuse of Money.' He had much to say both on the spending and making of money which might very profitably be put alongside Dr. Chisholm's address on wealth. Dr. Chisholm pictures employers and employees as two great parties in industry who work hand-in-hand during the year and then throw on a bonfire the results of more than two months' work. 'Sir Josiah Stamp, after careful investigation, says that the nations of Europe expend annually on armaments about eight per cent. of the national dividend, or the equivalent of at least a month's work every year of all the producers and plant of these nations. In order to avoid exaggeration, let us place the amount thus expended at two weeks' work. This is not the only means of wasteful expenditure. The expenditure on gambling in its various forms devours more than the expenditure on armaments, so we find ourselves working as a nation for at least another three weeks, but using the income thus secured for betting, while we dissipate the result of other four weeks' work on alcohol.' What is Dr. Chisholm's conclusion about the rightful spending of money? 'Someone,' he says, 'has declared that the motto of a good many Christians is to make money according to the laws of Political Economy and to spend it according to the laws of Christianity. While a very imperfect principle, if men and women did spend the money they make in the most beneficial ways, our real social problems of destitution and distress would be solved.'

But the problem of making money is equally important, and here Dr. Chisholm deprecates the tendency which exists to-day to attribute the weakness of our social life 'to the fact that we have departed from the ideal of the Mediæval Church. That Church, many tell us, held before Europe a great ideal and endeavoured to enforce that ideal. "Each for all and all for God."' He finds that the teaching of the reformers was in no sense different in its ideals from the teaching of the great thinkers who preceded them and their social ideals in no wise less exalted than those of their predecessors. 'What is wrong and has always been wrong, is that the Church always lives below its ideals and that human nature never practises adequately what it professes.'

Life and Work, by Mr. Edward Shillito (Longmans; 4s. net), gives a brief summary of the discussions at the Universal Christian Conference which assembled at Stockholm from August 19th to 30th, 1925. The treatment of each topic is necessarily so brief that one gets the impression of a breathless race from subject to subject, and

no doubt the same impression must have been produced by the Conference itself. For any one, however, who simply wishes to know in general what was done, this little book gives a most lucid and readable account.

In *My Mission to China*, by the Rev. J. Russell Howden, B.D., of Southborough (Marshall Brothers ; 2s. 6s. net), we have a vivid account from an eye-witness of the extraordinary strikes and violent anti-foreign and specially anti-British demonstrations in almost all the Treaty Ports of China during the summer of last year, especially as they affected the lives of missionaries, their families, and their evangelistic agencies of every kind. Mr. Howden was invited by the trustees of the Milton Stewart Fund in the United States to go to China as their delegate to the Chinese Summer Conferences of the Missionaries of the China Inland Mission. The book is a most graphic narrative of experiences, which were almost dangerous adventures, in a succession of different towns. Nevertheless the writer discusses the causes of this extraordinary uprising with a clear desire to put the Chinese point of view against 'the foreign devils.'

To the Indo-Iranian Series of Columbia University there has been added *The Zoroastrian Doctrine of a Future Life*, by Jal Dastur Cursetji Pavry, A.M., Ph.D., sometime Lecturer in Indo-Iranian Languages in that University (Milford ; 12s. 6d. net). It is not a large book (one hundred and twenty pages), and forms the first of three volumes that are planned. For the present we are told only what happens to the soul during the three nights after death, and so on to the Chinvat Bridge and the individual Judgment. With what lies beyond that—Heaven, Hell, and the State of Equilibrium—our author is not as yet concerned.

The fact that Professor Jackson is the editor of the series is in itself an indication of what the book proves, that here we have a thorough, patient, and detailed work of scholarly investigation.

When the monarchs of the world stand before the Judgment Seat to give account of how they used their terrible responsibilities, it seems certain that to few will there be given a more royal welcome than to two rulers of India, Akbar and Aśoka. It is questionable, indeed, if any one of them has ever used his chances to such high purpose as the latter, or can challenge his pre-eminence. His character after his conversion to Buddhism, his care for his people, his zeal as a missionary, the splendour of his achievements, his yearning to make life a deeper and a worthier thing for all, his bewildering toleration, his generous unselfishness, the mark he has left on the world, where can one find among the kings a rival to all that? Here comes a second edition of a little book about him by a fine discriminating balanced mind—*Aśoka*, by Dr. James M. MacPhail (Oxford University Press ; 2s. 6d. net). It is one of an admirable series—'The Heritage of India' Series—and one of the best of them. If in the little space (about one hundred pages) certain statements have to be left unqualified, there is always fullness of knowledge and a sane guide leading us.

In *Philips' New Scripture Atlas* (G. Philip & Son ; 1s. net) will be found an illuminating historical geography of Palestine and the lands of the Bible as easy to consult as it is easy to handle. In addition to a full-page map of Palestine in the time of Christ there are section maps of the Early Journeyings, the Galilean Ministry, the first Judæan Ministry, the second Judæan Ministry, the Sea of Galilee, and the Environs of Jerusalem.

To the series of 'Memoirs of Mighty Men,' which Messrs. Pickering & Inglis are publishing in shilling volumes, they have now added a Life of *Frederick Stanley Arnot*, the Glasgow boy who, inspired by the story of David Livingstone, proved by his heroic life as a missionary in Central Africa a scarcely less remarkable man. The narrative has been re-written by Mr. James J. Ellis. Arnot, of whom this book gives a speaking likeness, was as gentle as he was brave, and in all his perils and difficulties never forgot that he was an ambassador of the Prince of Peace.

The Achievement of the Master, by Professor H. R. Purinton and Sadie Brackett Costello (Scribners ; $1.25), is a very useful summary of the life and work of Jesus, based mainly on the Gospel of Mark, the Logia, and the Letters of St. Paul. It is intended for the use of high school and college pupils, and at the end of each chapter there is given a somewhat full list of questions and suggestions for discussion. Both of the writers are practical teachers who have used the material

here given, and whose aim has been to lead their students to realize the spiritual meaning of the historical facts, and to apply the principles to modern social and individual life.

A story with as much romance in it as the heart of any boy or girl could desire has been written by Miss Amy Carmichael—*Raj, Brigand Chief* (Seeley, Service; 6s. net). It is the account of an Indian Robin Hood driven by persecution to Dacoity; of his life of daring, feats of strength, escapes and tortures, his robbery of the rich and generosity to the poor, his sincere conversion to Christianity and his tragic end. It is an amazing story, but it is a true one. Miss Carmichael has herself verified the facts. In a Foreword by the Bishop of Travancore, it is stated that, although parts of the story are too good and others too bad to believe, yet they are all fact and not fiction. This book should be kept in mind at Christmas time.

In *In Himalayan Tibet* we have the latest addition to the series of historical-geographical books, fully illustrated, issued by Messrs. Seeley, Service & Co. (21s. net). This is the joint work of Mr. A. Reeve Heber, M.D., Ch.B., and his wife, Kathleen M. Heber, M.B., Ch.B., B.Sc., 'a record of twelve years spent in the topsy-turvy land of lesser Tibet with a description of its cheery folk, their ways and religion, of the rigours of the climate and beauties of the country, its fauna and flora.' From its high altitude Tibet has been called 'the roof of the world'; the authors of this volume call it 'topsy-turvy land,' because so many of the customs of its people are just the reverse of our notions of correctness, and the strangest incongruities prevail. Our best rooms are on the ground floor; in Tibet the higher you go the better is the accommodation, whilst the best is on the roof. We have our flower garden around the house; in Tibet it is on the roof, and the place for a 'button-hole' is behind the ears, 'giving a much more saucy effect, especially when so near to sparkling brown eyes.' We regard the protrusion of the tongue as an impertinence; in Tibet it is a very polite form of greeting. The pungent and distinctive smell of the native of the East is unpleasant in Western nostrils, and *vice versa*. The roof of the world is bounded by the highest mountains and perpetual snow, but as in Swiss so in Tibetan valleys the flowers that bloom in their season seem to have a surpassing loveliness. Dr. Heber and his wife write with enthusiasm both of the country and its people. They make it sometimes difficult in their too detailed descriptions for the reader to see the wood for the trees. It has been said by competent authorities that the Tibetans are 'the most religious' people on the face of the globe, but so large a proportion of them are associated with the monasteries all over the country that the population is steadily declining. The authors of this volume tell us that 'where all the best religions of the world will at least point upwards, as it were, to "whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report" as worthy of contemplation, here the whole force of Lamaism directs the people's attention downwards to that which is impure, ugly and evil.'

The latest addition to the excellent series of illustrated guide-books published by Messrs. Seeley, Service & Co. is *Things Seen in Norway* (3s. 6d. net), written by Mr. S. C. Hammer, M.A., of the University of Oslo, formerly Christiania, the capital of this beautiful country of mountain and river and fjord. Mr. Hammer has had to deal with an embarrassment of riches of the most varied kind, but he has made his choice with the knowledge of an expert. A most excellent text-book has been beautifully illustrated.

The Foolish People of the Bible is the title of a series of Lenten sermons by the Rev. J. A. Craigie, Vicar of Montacute, Somerset, and published by Messrs. Skeffington & Son (2s. net). It is a modest looking volume, but it is full of really excellent matter. There are two very different types of 'foolish people.' In one type we have the atheist, the churl, and the rich fool; in the other and very different type we have the 'fools for Christ's sake' and 'the preacher,' both treated with true insight.

We have a series of very different sermons from the same publishers, entitled *The Church and her Sacraments*, by the Rev. F. R. Dean, M.A., D.Litt., D.D., Vicar of Edingley-W-Halam, Notts (3s. 6d. net). Here we have the views of a Churchman who classes Dissent as 'fundamentally unscriptural.'

Reasonable Christianity, by an aged Priest (Skeffingtons; 2s. 6d. net), is a pleasant and in-

orming book. It contains the mature reflections f one who has a firm grip of the fundamentals, nd a serene and settled faith. It detracts conderably from the value of the book that there are o divisions into chapters. The writer urges the eed for greater unity and co-operation between he Church and Nonconformists, and he criticises he ultra-liberal teaching of the Modernists.

Here comes yet another of the attractive little olumes in which (apart from his long Blanquerna) rofessor E. Allison Peers is sharing that fascinating gure Ramón Lull with the English-speaking world. *he Tree of Love* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net) is the tter half of the Catalan book, and has never efore been translated into any modern language. t is commended to us as the most many-sided nd the least mystical of the lesser works.

However that may be, it has not gripped us as 'The Art of Contemplation' or 'The Book of the over and the Beloved' did. As we read, there was a curious dimness that would gather before he mind's eyes. For a time we kept rubbing it way. But by and by the book was laid aside. Others, however, should test it for themselves.

Faith, Fancies, and Fetich; or, Yoruba Paganism, by the Rev. Stephen S. Farrow, B.D., Ph.D. (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net), is an account of the religious beliefs of certain West African tribes. It is a fine study, written in an admirably sympathetic spirit, and with a fullness of knowledge which has very frequently to correct the easy assumptions or the ignorance of some who have gone before. Any one interested in the thought and the religion of West Africa should get this book.

It is a strange world into which we are introduced, among a likeable people—though when detected in falsehood they merely remark blandly, 'Did you not know that I was *talking Yoruba*?' with odd customs and ways—a king must eat the heart of his predecessors, and worship his head, which at last is buried with his body while his own goes to his successor. They are a religious folk. Are not their salutations? 'Until the morning! May God wake us up well!' and 'Good morning. Do you wake well?' 'Thanks be to God!' In West Africa there is always the background of the mysterious. And Dr. Farrow frankly admits that he now suspends judgment upon certain eerie things at which he once scoffed. There is a Heaven and a kind of dry, waterless Hell. But there is also a doctrine of metempsychosis. Beyond question there are clear evidences of belief in one Supreme God, greater by far than all the lesser deities, too great and august to be approached even in prayer. He is the Creator; though he seems to have made us only in the rough, leaving a lesser being to endow the crude lump of a thing with features and the senses. None the less he is there; and Dr. Farrow is not certain that the evolutionary theory of religion is proved.

The native question in South Africa, always so vast and threatening, has afresh become a burning subject of discussion through the action of General Hertzog in passing his Colour Bar Bill. If one should desire a careful and well-informed survey of the whole question nothing better could be found than *The Race Problem in South Africa,* by the Rev. W. A. Cotton, B.A. (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net). The treatment is both sane and Christian, and is marked by a moderation befitting the great complexity of the problem. The writer favours a *via media* between the extremes of Intermarriage and Territorial Segregation, which he does not regard as mutually exclusive. It is a most lucid and informing book.

To compress into one small volume a history of the missionary enterprise of the Christian Church, from the age of the Apostles to the present day, may well be deemed a bold and difficult task. It has been achieved with considerable success in *A Study of World Evangelization,* by the Rev. David Jenks (S.C.M.; 4s. net). In so great a multitude of names minor errors are inevitable. One notes Argyle (for Argyll), Nyassaland (now spelt Nyasaland), and it seems misleading to describe Dr. Duff as 'of the Established Church of Scotland.' The narrative, in spite of extreme compression, is wonderfully readable, and gives a very fair and comprehensive survey of the whole field.

It is not often one comes on a book on religious education so good as that by Miss Helen Wodehouse, D.Phil., *The Scripture Lesson in the Elementary School* (S.C.M.; 3s. net). Dr. Wodehouse adopted an unusual method. She asked about a hundred teachers by letter for their experience and advice. But she has not simply served up these, no doubt, diverse opinions. She has passed them

through her own mind and has written on the basis of her questionnaire a book packed with wisdom. There is a great deal of sound counsel for young teachers on the soundest lines, and chapters of a simple kind are devoted to the art of story-telling, to expression work, to memory work, to the devotional side, and, last of all, to some of the most serious difficulties of teachers. There is nothing stereotyped in these brief chapters, but a great deal of practical help, put often in an original fashion. An unusually good book on its subject.

A revised edition of *Christian Fellowship in Thought and Prayer*, by Mr. Basil Mathews, M.A., and Mr. Harry Bisseker, M.A., has been issued by the Student Christian Movement (2s. net). It was first published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton in 1919.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

A Present for Jesus.[1]

'"There is not a present to bring to the man of God. What have we?" The servant answered, "I have ninepence here for you to give the man of God." "Good," said Saul.'—1 S 9^{7-10}.

ARE you a sleepy head, so drowsy in the morning that they can't get you awake? Ah, well! for once there was no need for them to call and call, and come and shake you, and pull the bedclothes off at last. This morning you were awake long before the sun got up, lay there in the darkness so excited and thrilly, till at last you couldn't wait, had to creep down to the foot of the bed and feel your stocking. And, oh! how lovely and bulgy it was! And after that it was so hard to lie there waiting in the dark, thinking and thinking whatever that square, lumpy thing you had felt halfway down could be; and what that other little parcel that was so thin and pointed. And as soon as nurse came in and lit the light, you were up with a whoop and out, and at them all. No sleeping in on Christmas morning, is there?

What do you do in your house about Christmas? Oh, well, you say, it begins a long, long time before. For, you see, it takes so long to save up pennies. And it took such a heap of them to get that pot of tulips you wanted for Dad. And what with all your lessons you haven't much time for making things. And it's so difficult not to get caught. One day when you were working at her present, before you knew, Mother popped in, and you had just time to sit on it, and how the needle jagged you! But she didn't see! And another day when you heard her coming you threw Nannie's into a drawer, and ran to the other side of the room. And when you looked back, there was a corner of it hanging out, quite plain. But somehow she never noticed it, and though in the end you had to ask her to wash it for you, she hadn't an idea it was for her; and was so surprised and pleased when she got it this morning.

And then, on Christmas Eve, you hang up your stocking, of course. But the big presents you get at breakfast-time. And what a heap of things there are on every plate! Oh! it's a lovely day.

So that's the way you do it, is it? It sounds very jolly. But here's a fine thing they do over in Ireland. On Christmas Eve the door is left unlocked, and the blinds are not drawn down, and a light is put to burn beside a window or two. Why? Well, you see, they want to give a present to Jesus. It would never do, they think, to forget Him. How ashamed you would be if there was nothing upon Mother's plate, not even one small parcel; if no one had remembered to get anything for her at all. And wouldn't it be horrid if we all forgot, if every one forgot to give a present to Jesus?

But what can we do? And what ever can we give Him? Well, these Irish people remember how the first Christmas, Joseph and Mary were out in the dark and cold, with no bed and no food, and no roof above them. And perhaps this Christmas some other poor folk may be homeless and cold and tired and hungry, and perhaps if we are kind to them, Jesus will take it as a little present to Himself. And so they set the candle in the window. And everybody knows it means if any one is cold

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

ad homeless, here is a door open, and a bed and od and welcome for Christ's sake.

Now couldn't you do something like that? I on't know if Mother would let you set a candle in he window, or ask just anybody to come in. And et, can't you, too, think out some wee present r Jesus like that? That boy whose people don't eep Christmas and who feels so out of it, couldn't ou do something for him? That girl whose ummie and Daddy are far away, and who has no hristmas parties, couldn't you ask her in and give er a good time? Isn't there some poor man or oman you could help? Jesus would take that s the nicest of all presents, better than almost nything you could do for Himself. Don't leave is plate quite empty!

Yes, and there's more than that. For this Christ- has too, just like that first one long ago, He is left n the dark and cold, homeless and with nowhere to ay His head. You haven't a house to offer Him. o, but you have your heart. What do you say to etting up a lighted candle in its windows, yes, in very one of them. And perhaps Jesus, seeing hem, will say, 'There is a door open for Me, and warm welcome waiting Me, and a wee girl or wee ad who wants Me'; and He will come.

On Joining the Mustard Club.[1]

'Joined to all the living.'—Ec 9^4.
'As a grain of mustard seed.'—Mt 17^{20}.

I wonder if you have seen the big posters all over the country which stare at you in vivid colours, 'Join the Mustard Club'?

People wouldn't spend such a lot of money on posters unless they thought that their advice was most important. What does it mean? First of all, what is a club, and what does it mean to join one? The dictionary says, 'A club is an asso- ciation of persons united by some common in- terest meeting periodically for co-operation.' That sounds very big, but in our own words it means, 'Joining with others to do something we want to do.'

Most boys want to join a club: a football club, for instance. You hear that some boys in your district are going to form one. You go to them, and you say, 'I want to be in it. Can I join?'

Then the bigger boys will look very wise and doubtful, and whilst they consult together you are shaking in your shoes, but at last they say, 'Yes, you can join.' After dancing about you go home to tell your mother you have joined the club. She is pleased, and buys your clothes and your boots for you. Then your mother goes on to say that she hopes you are quite fit to join that club, that you are big enough and strong enough to play with the other boys, and that you are sporty enough to take the place they give you, and to work for the team and not for yourself. Not all boys are fit to join clubs. Some are not clubbable. They are like the boy who was batting, and the umpire gave him out. 'Have I to go out,' he said. 'Yes,' said the umpire. 'Then,' said the boy, 'I'll take my bat home.' You see, he was not clubbable. He had something to learn. What it means to join a club is this: 'To act with others for the good of all.'

What, then, does it mean to join the Mustard Club? I suppose the people who put out the posters want you to buy mustard. Mustard is a very useful thing. People use mustard to give relish to meat. Shakespeare makes one of his characters say: 'What say you to a piece of beef and mustard?' which shows that they have so used it in England for hundreds of years. A school- boy in a little essay once defined mustard as 'that which makes cold meat taste bad when you don't put any on.' Mustard is useful for other things. It warms. It gives a pleasant tingle to the body when you use it in the bath. A mustard plaster will burn a pain away. The people who advertise want you to buy it and use it. They call that joining the Mustard Club.

I don't mind whether you join that club or not. It is all a matter of taste, but there is a club it would be good to join. Join those people who make sure that life tastes good. Go in for those things that give relish and interest and joy to life.

One of them is *Pleasure*. We all ought to have some pleasure. Just as we have mustard with our meat, so we should have pleasure with our work and our daily life. We need a warning here. We need not seek for pleasure. We must not want *all* pleasure. Just as it wouldn't do to have a meal of mustard, so it won't do to seek a life of pleasure. There was a boy who made a very sad mistake. He saw on the table a pot of mustard, and he thought it was custard, so he put a dessert-spoonful in his mouth which made him shed some tears. A boy who is looking for pleasure all the time is like

[1] By the Reverend Cecil Nicholson, Darwen.

that. To want all pleasure is bad. Sooner or later it bites. If you will just be good and kind, and stick to your work, you will get, as you go along, enough pleasure to make life taste good.

Another thing is *Keenness*. Mustard is keen. That is why it gives relish, and if you want the best of life you will be keen about something good. One of our greatest schoolmasters said not long ago, 'There are two kinds of boys and two kinds of men: those who nip life, and those who grip life.' We shall all be happier and better if we grip life, and the way to grip life is to be as keen as mustard when we are after the best things. 'Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might.'

Another thing is *Love*. Mustard is warm. It comforts, and so should we. We are in the world to live with one another and to love one another. To have a warm heart is even better than to have a clever head. The best joy in the world comes into our hearts when we learn to look on others with love. That is life's best taste of all.

Then remember that mustard is made from a very little seed. Our Lord Jesus Christ used to talk about it. He said His Kingdom was like a grain of mustard seed. It was a very little thing, but it had life in it, and it would grow, and it would do good. He wanted those who loved Him to be on the side of that little seed, not to be ashamed of it because it was small, but to love it and help it to grow. Yes! and He wants you to do that, to stand up for the good when it is small and weak. He wants you to be heroes. He asks you to join the 'Order of the Grain of Mustard Seed,' and to be good and brave and faithful all the time for Him.

The Kookaburra.

'They did eat their meat with gladness and with singleness of heart.'—Ac 2^{46}.

'God loveth a cheerful giver.'—2 Co 9^{7}.

There is a bird in the Bush which all Australians love. Its name in the Zoological Garden is the 'Kookaburra,' but its name in the Bush is the 'Laughing Jackass.' He is not as large as a pigeon. His head is almost as big as his body; and he has a great beak, which he opens wide when he laughs. You cannot be sulky when the Kookaburra laughs. Mothers often say to their girls and boys when they are cross, 'Why, there is the Jackass laughing at you,' and they look up and smile. What is it that makes him so popular? There are several things about him that we like.

He is a friendly fellow. He looks friendly with his great beak coming out of his big wise-looking head; and he has such a kindly eye. When I am digging in my garden there are two of them which come and sit on the fence or low branch of a tree, and watch me while I work. There are people who say that they are only looking for the grubs which I may turn up with my spade—that it is only cupboard love, but I am sure there is more in it than that. I like them, and they like me. We are friends.

Another thing which makes the Laughing Jackass popular is the fact that he kills snakes. If he sees a snake in the grass he swoops down and picks it up, catching it by the back of the neck so that it cannot bite him, and carries it high into the air, then drops it; and while it is still stunned with the fall, he picks it up again, and repeats the process until the snake is dead. Does he not deserve to be popular, when he does what he can to rid the Bush of these poisonous reptiles, which are the dread of the forest?

But I think it is mostly his laugh, which makes people love him. He is such a cheerful fellow. Early in the morning you hear him in the Bush greeting the new day with a laugh, and at sunset saying 'Good-night' to all the inhabitants of the forest with a laugh; and on a wet day, you hear his laugh in the Bush, and you say, 'It is going to clear,' and you soon find that he is a true prophet; he can see the first trace of the sun breaking through the mist and the rain. And he does not keep the good news to himself, he tells it to the whole world.

No wonder he is a popular fellow. I think I have read somewhere that God wants us to be like this bird in these four ways.

He is friendly. And does not the Bible say that, 'He who would have a friend must show himself friendly'?

He is death on Snakes—the mean, poisonous things which creep unseen in the grass and strike at you from their hiding-places. And does not God say that we are to crush the serpent's head, that is, we are to kill the mean and poisonous things which spoil the beautiful things of life?

He is a bearer of good news. He tells you that the new day is coming, and that the clouds are breaking, and soon the sun will be shining. And does not Jesus say that we, His disciples, are to be

e bearers of good news? One of the last things hich He said before He left the earth was, 'Go o all the world, and tell the glad news to everydy.'

And he laughs. He does everything with a ugh. He is a cheerful fellow. And does not the ible say that 'God loves the cheerful giver.' nd I am sure God loves the cheerful worker, the heerful player, the cheerful friend, the cheerful iller of good news, and every other kind of cheerful erson. Learn from the Kookaburra to do things ith a laugh.

The Christian Year.

Third Sunday in Advent.

Rock of Ages.

'Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner one.'—Is 28^{16}.

The Foundation is Christ. What nobler, or more sufficient, or more incomparable foundation an we have?

1. Christ in His *redemption* is the Rock on which e rely. What ails you and me? Grief? Yes, ut more than grief. Ignorance? Yes, but orse than ignorance. Strife? Yes, but that hich feeds the flames of strife. It is sin which ils us. And men have sought the healing of sin n a multitude of ways, leaving no method untried hich might bring the sense of pardon and peace. Augustine portrayed the weary search in the *Confessions*, and Bunyan in the *Grace Abounding*, and Pascal in the *Thoughts*. Thomas Bilney knew it, nd George Fox, and John Wesley. We have known it, too, who are smaller than these princes f the chariot. By forgetfulness, or by formalism, r by self-centred effort, or by sacrifice and suffering, we strove to rid ourselves of sin. But it was useless; until we 'saw our Saviour plain,' and trusted none but Christ, and were healed by the medicine of His blood. And as the cure commenced n an act of simple faith, it is continued and completed by the habit of simple faith. We are edeemed from the power, as from the curse of sin, y looking away unto Jesus. The remembrance of Him, the cry to Him, and the appropriation of Him, n each of our hazards, make us more than conquerors. There is a town Bethel, Pastor von Bodelschwingh's Bethel, near Bielefeld in Westphalia—a marvellous town which the sick inhabit, and the epileptics, and the men and women who have been defeated in the battle of life. It is a place to bring the tears to the eyes, and to fill the heart with psalms of praise. One house there is the Brockensammlung. It is a great depository of the worn-out things, the cracked and spoiled and frayed and fragmentary things, for which people have no more use. Tattered books, tin soldiers without arms or heads, dolls whose beauty is only a memory, trinkets twisted out of shape and corroded by rust, clothes which are relics of a far-off past—ten thousand boxes of them will arrive in a single year. And the epileptics and the unemployed, with friends to show them how, first disinfect them, and then stitch or press or paint or burnish or supplement them, till the crooked is straight, and the defective is whole, and the old is young, and the ugly is fair. The Brockensammlung epitomizes Bethel itself. And it is parable and miniature of Jesus Christ. He takes our rude souls and refines them, our broken souls and mends them. He ends our sin, our sickness, and our death.

Christ in His *rule* is the Rock on which all strong and abiding lives are built. Men have always been eager to learn how the art of living can best be carried out. In Greece, the Epicurean said that happiness was the standard; and the Stoic retorted, 'No, not happiness, but duty'—duty which preserves the stars from wrong. In Palestine, the Pharisee held that an external righteousness should be the governing force; and the Essene, in his limestone cave by the Dead Sea, held that meditation and a rigorous seclusion from the pollutions of the crowd were the aims which the soul must seek. So it has been in other lands and times—the mind probing into the question of where the highest good is to be found, and the will trying to translate this answer or that into the experience of every day. But only in Christ do men see the path running straight before them, which leads to holiness and fruitfulness here, to glory and God hereafter. Only in Him we live well and greatly. It is not merely that He is the Supreme Pattern. It is that He is the Indwelling Power. His Spirit imparts to us His own life, and a union so vital with a Keeper so Divine changes us into His likeness. 'When I say Christ is God, and my Christ is God,' wrote a great Christian of the seventeenth century, 'I have said all things, I can say no more.' That is profoundly true. We have found the ultimate and final word, when we designate Christ as God and our own.

2. If Christ is Foundation, God Himself lays the Foundation. And what assurance and what exultation this recollection should stir!

I travel far back in thought. Beyond the birth of constellations and worlds. Beyond the creation of man. God is in His eternal past. Foreseeing our fall and sin and misery—their freedom, their wilfulness, their evil—He nevertheless yielded up His Son to the mission, so heavy both for the Sender and for the Sent, of saving us. The mission would have crushed an archangel's strength, and would have exhausted the love burning in the seraph's heart of fire; but Christ is competent to discharge it. God entrusts it to Him; and, in that untracked and untrackable everlastingness, the Stone is laid.

Then I travel down the ages until I arrive at the *annus Domini*—the acceptable year of the Lord, when St. John and the others beheld His glory, glory as of the Only Begotten of the Father. The incarnation enrols Christ in our needy company. The obedience is His fulfilment for us of all righteousness. The crucifixion is His bearing of our condemnation. The resurrection is the guarantee that His work is accepted and crowned. The ascension is the prophecy of His opening to us the gates of the City of God. More than ever, the Stone is well and truly laid.

Forward yet I journey. The Day of Pentecost has come. The Spirit descends in tongues of flame. The New Testament Church receives its baptism of Power from on high. And wherever its envoys go, they preach Christ, urging men to cease building on sinking foundations of sand, and to plant faith and life on Him. Men believed then, and have been believing ever since. The *Gude and Godlie Ballate* speaks the truth even about the darkest times:

> Lord God, Thy face and Word of grace
> Hes lang bene hid by craft of men,
> Till at the last the nycht is past,
> And we full weill their falset ken:
> Yit God did feid His chosin indeid,
> As Noy, and Lot, and mony mo,
> And had respect to His elect,
> How ever the blind warld did go.

A great cloud of witnesses gathers about me, to bear testimony that the Stone is being laid more firmly still.

So we reach ourselves. Has God broken our pride, and taught us to boast, all the day long and all the year through, solely and victoriously in Christ, the Teacher we confide in, the Redeemer we trust, the Ruler we obey? [1]

Fourth Sunday in Advent.

The Comfort of a Man.

'A man shall be as an hiding-place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land.'—Is 32^{2}.

When Isaiah says with such simplicity *a* man, he means any man, he means the ideal for every man. Having in v.[1] laid down the foundation for social life, he tells us in v.[2] what the shelter and fountain force of society are to be; not science or material wealth, but personal influence; the strength and freshness of the human personality. It is a call to every one, to every one who has received the gift of power and recognizes it. And the call is to use the power so as to become a shelter, so as to become the shadow of a great rock in a weary land. Let us take examples. It would be best if we could take ordinary instances, the men and women of like passions, and of like circumstances, such as we are. For the power is given to every one to become the shadow of a great rock. The recognition of the gift may be wanting as well as the use of it. But whoever will may have it and use it. There is no doubt that it would be best if we could take ordinary instances, but it is not possible. Ordinary men and women are not sufficiently well known. There is not enough known about them. We must take outstanding examples.

1. Let us take *Samson* first. It is not easy to make use of the career of Samson for edification. But we know that he received power. It is distinctly stated that the Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him. And he used it. He used it according to his understanding and according to his circumstances. His power was in his own right arm. Single-handed he sought to stem the tide of Philistine encroachment. The effort was inadequate, but it was not so utterly inadequate as it seems to us. For it was made in the youth of the nations, and nations, like men, make more of physical strength in their youth than afterwards. According to the gift that was given him, and in spite of certain disabilities, Samson did become to his own time and people the shadow of a great rock in a weary land.

[1] A. Smellie, *Out of the Desert a Gift*, 21.

The land was very weary. These uncircumcized Philistines were a sore trial. Immigrants into the land of Palestine, which is now called after their name, they had come from afar—some say the island of Crete—and they had seized or built certain strong cities by the seacoast. They were able and ambitious. They desired to possess the whole land. They were not careful to use legitimate means of accomplishing it. Already it had begun to be a life-and-death struggle between Israel and the Philistines.

And what if the Philistines should win? Is there a promise that through *them* all the nations of the earth shall be blessed? Will Isaiah come from Ashdod? Will the Messiah be born in Askelon? There Samson stood, the shadow of a great rock in that weary, weary land, using the power that had been given him, and in the way he understood it had been given him to use.

2. Take *Samuel* next. Samson was an athlete: Samuel was a statesman. Samson used the hand: Samuel used the head. The war is still with the Philistines. But it has now become manifest that no single hand, however strong, can bring relief. Samuel's task is to gather the tribes of Israel together and make a nation of them.

It may be that when the tribes of Israel feel the throb of nationality they will demand a king. Will Samuel refuse to give them a king? Will he plead that they have no king but Jehovah? He may have to give them a king. For God's ways are not as our ways. Through the gift of a king, a King may come.

Moreover, the war is still with the Philistines. And the Philistines are now more formidable than they were in the days of Samson. It may be, not only that the tribes of Israel must be gathered into a nation, but also that the nation requires a leader. And when Saul presented himself—look at him, head and shoulders taller, and a king every inch of him, for it is still the world's youth and the physical has more than its value—when Saul appeared, Samuel anointed him king. Samuel doubted the wisdom of it. But we see now that in that self-effacing act Samuel had become to his people as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land.

3. Let *Isaiah* come third. If Samson used his power with the hand, and Samuel with the head, Isaiah reached the heart. But first his own heart must be reached. He must himself come into right relation with God before he can begin to do the work which God has given him to do. Is this a new departure in God's leading? It is most momentous.

Samson had a personal feud with the Philistines, and that personal feud was the occasion (shall we say the opportunity?) for the exercise of the gift which God had given him, that the Philistines might be kept in check. Samuel was a patriot. The personal feud was swallowed up in the national quarrel. Now the first duty of the patriot is obedience. But obedience to whom? Obedience to the superior. One man has soldiers under him, and he says to this one, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh. But he himself is also set under authority. And when it comes to the king at last, even he has his superior in Jehovah. Samuel had to teach Saul that to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.

But there is a greater sphere than the patriot's. It is the sphere of the prophet. And there is a greater virtue than obedience. It is reverence. Isaiah learns first of all that the God of Israel is a holy God; and then he learns that the God of Israel is the God not of Israel only, but of the whole earth. He learns that the God of Israel is a holy God. Samson was not concerned with holiness in God, or with its immediate consequence, righteousness in man. A rude sense of justice he had, but little sense of obligation to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly before his God. Even Samuel was more concerned with the welfare of the nation than with his own moral approach to God. Isaiah can do nothing until his lips have been touched with the live coal from off the altar. It is most momentous.

And as soon as he learns that God is a God of holiness, Isaiah learns also that He is the God of the whole earth. The same God who reaches to the heart stands in the centre of the Universe. And ludicrous as it will appear in moments of unbelief, he sees that his message is to the inhabitants of Sidon and to the men of Babylon, and he answers at once, 'Here am I, send me.'

4. The last is *Paul*. The athlete, the statesman, the prophet—beyond these there is a higher, the Christian. John the Baptist was a prophet—there hath not arisen a greater prophet than John the Baptist. Nevertheless, he that is least in the Kingdom of God is greater than he.

What is the Christian's secret? It is love. Samson did not understand it. He considered neither the Philistines nor the foxes when he sent the burning brands through the corn. Samuel did

not understand it. 'I remember what Amalek did to Israel'—and Samuel hewed Agag in pieces before the Lord. Isaiah did not understand it. But stay—Isaiah had at least a glimpse of it. Or if not Isaiah, then that other who said, 'Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows.'

For if love is the secret of the Christian, the secret of love is self-sacrifice. 'Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels (and of prophets), and have not love, I am nothing. Love suffereth long and is kind.'

The shadow of a great rock? Samson will do in the days of youth; Samuel in manhood, when patriotism is the divinity; Isaiah as the years pass, and the patriot finds that there is a God of the Gentile as well as of the Jew. But there is no refuge for a whole wide world of weariness except in the love of Him who loved me and gave Himself for me.

Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee.

CHRISTMAS DAY.

The Two Census Books.

'There went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be enrolled.'—Lk 2^{1} (R.V.).

'They which are written in the Lamb's book of life.'—Rev 21^{27}.

These two texts bring before our mind two census books. One of them stands at the very beginning of the gospel. We are introduced to it in the Christmas story which tells us of the birth of Jesus. Cæsar Augustus, Tiberius Cæsar, second in order of the Emperors of Rome, decided to make a census of the inhabitants of all his provinces. The people were to report themselves in their own native places—at any rate, so far as the Jews of Palestine were concerned. The purpose of the census was probably that the people might be registered, to be assessed for taxation. Joseph, being a native of Bethlehem, went for enrolment there, with Mary, his wife, and there, immediately after their arrival, Jesus was born. He must have been entered on the census. That was the first book in which the name of Jesus Christ was written—the Name that is now above every name.

The other census book stands at the end of the gospel. It is a book written in heaven. Jesus' name is inscribed on the outside of this book. He has many names that go to make up that Name above every name. He is Jesus, the Saviour; He is Christ, the Anointed King; He is the Good Shepherd; He is the Light of the World; He is the Bright and Morning Star; and most wonderful of all, the Lamb of God. It is 'the Lamb's' book of life. As in Cæsar's book, the names of all who are alive are written there. It is His book of life.

1. The gospel *begins* with the name of Jesus Christ being written among the people living in the world. Strange and wonderful discoveries of old eastern documents—many of them much older than the time of Christ—have been made before this. Is it possible that some day there might be discovered the page of that book in which Joseph's and Mary's names and Jesus' are entered, that Cæsar might know how many subjects he had in Bethlehem? Probably it was not made of any parchment durable enough to survive long, and ages ago it was lost, or perished. But there it was, written among the facts of the world's history: Jesus, male child born to Mary, wife of Joseph, at Bethlehem. It reminds us that the gospel of Jesus Christ began in an event of history that could take its place among the world's records of fact. Every time we write a letter or enter a payment in a ledger, we testify that a change came for the world when Jesus was born. It was the greatest event in human history—the birth of Jesus. Have we ever tried to think how different our lives would have been if Jesus had not been born—if that event which could be written down as a fact in Cæsar's census book had not happened? We cannot think of it. We only know that there is hardly anything of all that we reckon most precious in our lives that we cannot trace back to that fact. It has made our homes what they have been in purity and tenderness; it has given us all that is strongest and sweetest in the influences that have been round our lives from babyhood. All our best thoughts of God, all our hopes of heaven have come from that. The cradle of Jesus has proved to be the cradle of the world's true hopes and joys.

And the other book is at the *end* of the gospel. 'They that are written in the Lamb's book of life.' What is the end of it all? If the wonderful things written in this New Testament are true, the end of it is that a people is to be gathered home to God; a people whose names can be written down as those who are alive. Alive, after what we call death is done with, looked back upon as one of the incidents of the past. And it is 'the Lamb's book of life.' The secret of life has been given them by Jesus, the Lamb of God. They are His people, their life is

owing to Him and owed to Him. What is a Christian? He is one who has come under the influence of that past fact that Jesus Christ came into the world: one whose life has been changed in many ways from misery to happiness, because Jesus Christ came into the world. We do not realize how dark the world is where Christ has not come to be known. The truth and benefits of Christianity have wrapped our lives round from the beginning. But all this, all the difference that it has made to us to have been born and brought up in a Christian land, that is all the work of the past upon us, something given to us from outside. And in the end we may be none the better for it. What is a Christian? There must be another answer that looks forward to the end. Shall we *live* then? Will our names be in the book of life?

2. Is this playing with the notion of these two census books in an unjustifiable way? There is no real parallel between them. The one was an actual book spoken of in a record of actual history; the other is only spoken of by a figure, in a book of visions and imagination. Think, then, about that difference between the two books. The one was an actual book—written with ink that you could see, on paper you could handle—that book of Tiberius Cæsar's. It was sent up by the registrar in Bethlehem to Cæsarea, or wherever the Palestine headquarters was, and then posted with other books to Antioch perhaps, the chief city of the province of Syria (to which Palestine belonged), and then perhaps to Rome, to be kept among the imperial archives. It was an actual thing; and being so it was temporary. How long do you suppose it was of the slightest interest to anybody? That census would be no use after a generation or so had passed. They would need to make another.

The other book is not an actual book—no, it is a book which is a spiritual fact, that could only be spoken of by a picture borrowed from material things. But which of the two books do you think really endures the longer—which of the two needs more to be reckoned with now, or in the ages to come? The spiritual fact is much more enduring than the material. The book that could only be spoken of in picture, is much more real than the other which was the tangible record of Cæsar's great dominions. 'The things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal.'

Cæsar's census book has perished; 'the Lamb's book of life' remains. It was an accident of time and circumstance that decided whose names were written in that book of Cæsar's; just those who happened to be living on the earth, within the lands of the Roman Empire, when it was compiled. But it is no accident that decides whose names are written in that other unseen book. It is the book of eternal destiny. It is the book of human character, and neither time nor circumstance determines that.

All the entries of our life on earth will soon be forgotten in this world's reckoning. Every paper that bears our name, unless we are among the few famous ones of the earth, will soon be destroyed past all recovery. The things that are seen are temporal. But there *is* an entry that will not perish. Will our name be written there?

3. Think of one other thing of which these two census books remind us. Whose are they? The one belonged to Cæsar; the other belongs to Christ.

The name of Jesus was written in Cæsar's book—He was entered as one of Cæsar's subjects. Is Cæsar's name written in Christ's book—in 'the Lamb's book of life'? We do not know, but which thing matters most? Was it an honour for Jesus to be written down among the subjects of Tiberius? Or was it an honour for Tiberius, had he known it, to have Jesus' name there? There can be no doubt about our answer to that. Does it not make us feel, as we think of it, how shallow and trumpery the world's judgments are? For Cæsar seemed to be the great king, and Jesus—what did He seem then, and for so long as Tiberius lived? A despised member of a despised race; one whom even that race despised, and hated so that they got Cæsar's deputy to make away with Him. Yet He is on the throne, and it is before Him that Cæsar's claims come to be tested.

Would *we* rather be written down in Cæsar's book or in Christ's? Cæsar's books are still being compiled—the books of the powers of this world: census books, books of honour, books of privilege, books of fame. Would we rather be written down in them, or in 'the Lamb's book of life'? Would we rather be written a patriotic citizen of the British Empire or a faithful Christian? We may have to choose between them. Which counts more with us, to win the world's 'well done,' or Christ's? We may have to choose one and abandon the other.

Jesus Christ's is the only book of *life*. 'Thou hast a name that thou livest, and art dead'—those are awful words, but they must be spoken to us,

if we get the world's reward, but reject the following of Jesus. Jesus Christ's is the only book of life. The only real life comes through living in the power of *His life*, which is the power of love.

We are keeping Christmas again. And as it comes, with its wonderful message, so incredible to the world's judgment still—for all the easy professions of belief in it—the message that in that baby born in the Bethlehem stable, and in that carpenter of Nazareth, and in that nameless Galilean preacher, and in that man suffering as a common criminal upon the Cross, tricked and hunted to death by religious men with a crowd to help them with their fickle shouting, was the incarnate God, whose love, shown in all that life of sorrow and that death of shame, redeems the world—it comes with a great call to us, putting before us a new opportunity, to choose which way shall be ours : to go with Him by faith, or to go with the world.

Faith in Him is conquest—spiritual conquest. There is a greater war to win than any that is waged on earthly battlefields, the war against our unbelief : and we each have to fight it out on the battlefield of our hearts.[1]

First Sunday after Christmas.

The Secret Guest.

'He entered into a house, and would have no man know it : and he could not be hid.'—Mk 7^{24} (R.V.).

For the need of His own soul did Jesus desire retirement and even secrecy. It was the repair of silence and solitude that He sought, and for this cause He would have no man know where He abode. This is one of the places in the Gospels where we are reminded of what ministry was meaning for Jesus and what it was costing Him. But for this record, and some few incidental revelations elsewhere, it were easy to be misled into the notion that, until Gethsemane saw His agony and Calvary was near, what Jesus did for men was lightly accomplished. He moved among men with the joy of redemptive service radiant about Him, but with the burden of it greatly and nobly hidden. Nevertheless, that burden was there, and it was heavy.

1. But it is to be observed that our Lord's sense of the need for refuge and silence had particular cause at this time. 'From thence he arose.' 'There were gathered unto him the Pharisees, and certain of the scribes, which had come from Jerusalem.' It was a sinister and malicious deputation come with intent of mischief. With them Jesus came face to face with hostility and hypocrisy, and with malice which took religion for a cloak. Arose then at once sharp controversy in which Jesus spake His mind with plainness and severity. There was laid on Him the duty of remonstrance and rebuke, and He discharged it without flinching or fear.

Now there be few who follow Christ who escape occasion when some such duty is manifestly theirs. If a man of business meets and is challenged by that which is clearly base or unjust, if so be that he follow Christ, he must then speak as one who so follows, and there will be laid on him in that hour the difficult duty of remonstrance and rebuke.

But there is something written here to remind us that there is no atmosphere more perilous for a Christian than that of controversy, and no duty with more danger in it for the soul than that of rebuke. 'From thence he arose.' To the silence and to God after the controversy and the rebuking, and if He needed it, much more do we when in following Him there falls on us a like duty. Many a true and courageous stand for right in the face of evil has been robbed of value, and has even become the occasion of new mischief, by the after-bearing of the witnesses. Did you ever do such a thing without having to search your own soul lest censoriousness should have crept in, or your words aiming at truth, have missed charity, or your bearing betrayed that sense of self-superiority in which the meekness of the Lord was not discernible ?

2. He had been that day made vividly conscious of the worst side of human nature. How it came about is hidden in the charity of the evangelist, and of the processes of His own mind we know nothing. But it is in this chapter, and immediately before we read of His hiding Himself, that there are set down certain shattering words of His about human nature. We seldom read these in public. It were wise of us to read them often in private, and steadily face up to what they mean and the truth of them. 'From within, out of the heart of man, evil thoughts proceed, fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, wickednesses, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, pride, foolishness ; all these evil things proceed from within and defile the man.'

'What do you make of sin ?' said a friend to

[1] H. C. Carter, in *Advent and Christmas Sermons*, 135.

Ernest Renan. 'Sin,' he said musingly; 'I suppose I suppress it.' But not so Jesus.

There are many counsellors who are perplexing in their inadequacy. They will tell you to ignore sin. If you fall, get up again, and waste no time reflecting. There are varieties of 'new thought' which are trenchant in their attack upon the old dogmatic because of the stress it has laid on the reality of moral evil and the fact of sin. One may be ready and eager for new thought, but it must square with the facts of an old Adam. When it offers, in response to the cry of the tyrannized soul, glib assurances about the facility of righteousness, it becomes farcical to men and women who know what human nature is.

Now it is easy when we have to face the badness of human nature, whether we make the discovery within ourselves or it is thrust on us by others; when we are compelled to recognize all the possibilities and actualities of evil in man, it is easy to become cynics. 'The more I have to do with my fellow-men, the more I respect my dog,' said one in whom the experience of the dark side of human nature was on the way to produce the finished cynic. It is easy also to become an easy self-excuser on the ground that our worst is relatively good.

The more we are compelled to recognize of this side of human nature, the more we will need to take opportunity for silence and communion with our own soul and with God. Behold the way of Jesus! 'From thence he arose,' from the perception and exposure of human evil and wrong. 'He arose and entered into a house, and would have no man know it.' Did He feel the need to see human nature afresh in the light of God? Did He feel that He must retrieve His faith in man by renewal of His faith in God? He was no romantic sentimentalist. No one who ever lived knew as He knew and felt the sinister side of human nature. But no one ever believed more triumphantly in man than He. Was it not because in these quiet hours of recollectedness and prayer He was able to correct this vision, to look at man from the side of God, and in view of all the Divine potentialities still remaining by virtue of the unextinguishable kinship of man with God, of the might of Divine redemption, of the magnificence of Divine grace? How much more do we need this! To be quiet and alone with God is to get a new and immeasurably more hopeful view of ourselves and our fellows, and we never need God so much as when we have most to do with men, unless it is when we most truly and deeply know ourselves.

3. We may pass now from the sequence which led to this retreat, to another suggestion. We are held by this desire of Jesus that no man should know where He abode. We suspect a purpose of blessing in it for the man whose house and home it was. It is excellent to think of Him as a guest; of what a blessing He was in the home at Bethany; of what a blessing He might have brought to the Pharisee's house if Simon, who was His host, had been of a more generous heart; of what a redemption came to the house of a publican when Jesus went to be guest to Zacchæus. There are also anonymous benefactors of Jesus of whom we wish we could know more. The goodman of the house, upon whose upper room furnished Jesus knew He could assuredly count, is one of the unknown and nameless friends of Jesus, over whom our imagination lingers. There is one of whom we know even less—the goodman of the house where Jesus lodged somewhere on the border of Tyre and Sidon. Only the devout imagination can recover him, for Jesus 'would have no man know' that He abode with this man of the marches.

It is still true that there are times when He abides with us and would have no man know it. There is a time for speech about Him, and we openly confess Him too tardily and reluctantly. There is a perpetual tendency for religion to lose the frankness of its utterance, and it is an unnatural thing and perilous. Nevertheless, there are times of rightful reticence.

I have seen a minister of Christ's gospel changed and his ministry transformed. Once it was superficial, flippant, ready for will-o'-the-wisps of easy speculation; it became deep, grave, and most steadfastly anchored to the great verities of the gospel. It was hard and steely, and it became tender and glowing. What lies between no man knows, save that a great sorrow opened the door of that minister's heart to the Lord, as sorrow does often open such doors for Him. But the Lord shut to that door, and who are we that we should seek to open it or pry into the ways of God with the soul of a man? We only know it by its sign, and of this we say: 'It is the Lord's doing, and marvellous in our eyes.'

4. Lastly, there is the frustrated secrecy. 'He would have no man know it; and he could not be hid.' It was because a little girl was in distress and

her mother in trouble that He could hide Himself no more. 'For a certain woman, whose young daughter had an unclean spirit, came and fell at His feet.' The love of Christ cannot keep itself to itself in a world of need. If Christ take up His abode with us, He cannot hide Himself to the end. It is to be known where He dwells, for the door of sympathy and succour is flung open at the approach of suffering and necessity. When once the feet of Christ have crossed the threshold of a human heart, all wounded feet may cross that threshold too.

Hereby we know if Christ be in us. He will discover Himself through us in sympathy and service. If He be our guest we shall no longer live unto ourselves. 'He could not be hid,' because there was a need outside too great for Him to withstand. There is, first, the love we receive. There is, second, the love we offer. My soul and my Saviour has its sequence in my neighbour and my service. The intimacy of my soul with its Saviour has its fruition in my responsiveness to all His love includes. First, a holy fellowship; then an availing and catholic charity. You never open your door so promptly in sympathy, or emerge so swiftly in service, as when for a season the door has been shut upon yourself and your Lord. No necessity is an intrusion, and no human need a stranger, when we know what it is to be much at home with Christ.[1]

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS.

An Attitude to Life.

'Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief.'—Mk 9^{24}.

Face to face with life there are only three possible attitudes to take up, three communions of the spirit, so to call them, to one or other of which every thinking person must commit himself. Face to face with life in its deep and permanent conditions a man must either believe, or harden his heart, or give way. That is to say, ultimately there are Christians, and Stoics, and those who are merely passing the time. Leaving out of account these last, there are ultimately only two attitudes which those who reflect upon life can take up towards it. We may accept life or we may defy life. We may take life humbly, or, having decided that most things are vain, may train ourselves to despise its miserable details, and to take pride in the power of our souls to bear without weakness the senseless accidents of fortune.

Any religious view of life, or any philosophical view which is held with such conviction as to give it the force of a religion, descends upon human hearts, and begins to become a force in history, always in a time of general collapse, when an old order of things is passing, and the aspect of the world for serious men is grave.

In the life of an ordinary human being, and in the general life of man, there are long stretches of regular and even experiences which provoke no deep questioning, times, it may be, when we are recovering from wounds, settling down after some upheaval, or so daunted by some well-remembered catastrophe that we go quietly; or times in which we are still enjoying the security which came, it may be, to our fathers in a great baptism of faith; and though that faith of theirs may not be held so acutely or honestly by us, still, we have not yet reached the stage when we abandon it, and our lives and policies have not yet embodied any open repudiation of their insight. We are living, as it were, in the long summer afternoon of a day of which they invoked and enjoyed the blessed dawn.

But a day comes when this peace is broken; for something happens—the loss of fortune, sickness, the hand of death—and suddenly life has raised certain questions for which we must find some honourable answer. Suddenly we find ourselves in a world which at least is not obviously a friendly world. It may be still a friendly world in its deeper intention; but this deeper friendliness is something towards which we are to work our way by the help of lights which for the most part are private. Meanwhile we stand in a shivered universe.

Krylov tells a story which, if we remember it, will recall these things to our mind some day when for one reason or another they have become urgent for ourselves. He tells of two farmers, whose fields had been devastated by the flooded river in their district. They pleaded to the god of the river to restrain the flood, but the flood persisted, and swept their crops away. Whereupon these two simple men went away to the great river, to the river which received the waters of the lesser rivers, and by receiving their waters seemed to justify their course. The two men went to the great river in order to plead with the god of the great river to restrain the violence of his subordinates. On and on they trod, not too sad

[1] T. Yates, *The Strategies of Grace*, 216.

because they had faith. But who shall say what happened in the depth of their souls when, approaching the great river, they saw, being borne on its proud wide bosom, their own ricks of grain! Krylov tells us that they stood still, looked at each other, shook their heads, and went home. What they did when they went home he does not tell us; but one or other of three things they were bound to do. One or other of three things they must have done; for there is no escape. They had either to believe in God with that deeper belief which becomes ours when we have to hold to it in spite of things. Perhaps they believed in God, and for the first time saw what belief in God may involve, what they should always have understood that belief in God might involve; that, as it involved for Jesus Christ Gethsemane and Calvary, so it might involve for us sinful men loss of goods or some heartbreak. They may have gone down upon their knees in a faith deeper than their natural despair. Or—and that shaking of their heads towards one another warns us of the possibility of this—they may from that hour have become desolate and embittered men, cursing life. Or, saddest of all, they may have gone home, and, instead of going in to comfort their wives and children, or to get comfort from them, they may have gone into the local tavern to drink vodka, and to drown their sorrows in forgetfulness.

But one or other of these three things they did; because, face to face with a deep challenge from the side of life, there is no escape for any of us from a decision.

'Let us eat, drink, and be merry; to-morrow we die.' That is the lowest voice. These words, of course, occur in Holy Scripture. Let us take the expression of the higher voice, though still far from the highest, not from Holy Scripture, for I confess I cannot find a verse of Scripture which without pressure can be made to embody the very mood. Let me take this from a poet of our time:

> Out of the night that covers me,
> Black as the pit from pole to pole,
> I thank whatever gods may be
> For my unconquerable soul.
>
> In the fell clutch of circumstance
> I have not winced nor cried aloud.
> Under the bludgeonings of chance
> My head is bloody, but unbow'd.
>
> Beyond this place of wrath and tears
> Looms but the horror of the shade,
> And yet the menace of the years
> Finds and shall find me unafraid.

That is fine. In the presence of such dignity and passion it little becomes us to argue with such a mood. We will only say that face to face with life it will not do. If Stoicism had sufficed for men there would have been no need, and no opening, for Christianity. And so there is the third attitude—for us, I trust, the only possible one; and since when all is said it is to our Holy Scriptures that we owe this final consolation and motive, from the Holy Scriptures we quote.

'Seeing that these things are all to be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy living and godliness, looking for and earnestly desiring the coming of the day of God, by reason of which the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? But according to his promise we look for a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Wherefore, seeing that ye look for these things, give diligence that ye be found in peace, without spot, and blameless in his sight.'[1]

[1] J. A. Hutton, *Discerning the Times*, 120.

A New Idea in Religious Education.

By the Reverend F. J. Rae, M.A., Director of Religious Education in Aberdeen Training Centre.

The United States of America is prolific in the literature of religious education. There is no national system as regards this subject in that country, but this defect (as we see it) has made the religious teachers in the States only the more anxious to perfect their presentation of religious truth to the young. They have many well-furnished seminaries with specialists who work on different aspects of the subject. And it is from America that the new idea referred to in the

title of this article has come. It is known as the 'Project Principle,' and it starts from a criticism of existing methods. On this side we have hitherto been content with a syllabus of instruction arranged on a chronological basis. That is to say, we begin with the Creation and go on from narrative to narrative until we cover the whole Bible. Psychology has come to our aid, and we have learned to omit certain narratives (like Abraham's intended sacrifice of Isaac) from the course for younger children. But on the whole we teach, or have taught, chronologically. Lately this method has been amended, and in many schools the teaching begins with the simple facts of daily life, of natural processes, and of the life of Jesus. The Old Testament stories are brought in as stories Jesus learned from His mother, or in illustration of certain truths of religion and morality. An excellent, if elaborate, example of this improved syllabus is that appended to Mr. Grigg-Smith's admirable book, *The Child's Knowledge of God.*

The advocates of the 'Project Principle' in the United States would like to scrap all this. Their criticism of it is that it is artificial, and not necessarily connected with a child's life. It is not germane to a child's actual present experience, unless by accident. A child learns by doing. It is actual living experience that is the way to knowledge in religion and in ethics. And the problem of the religious educator is how to provide or use life-experiences as the way to religious knowledge and the development of character. We must teach children truth and goodness through experiences which are *theirs* and which are *present* and within their orbit.

Now a Project is an experience which is real and present at the moment in the life of children in a class or even in a school, and which is to be made the instrument of training the children in faith and goodness. And the idea is to use this life-situation for teaching, bringing in the Bible as subsidiary, in the strict sense, to illustrate and enforce the lesson. Examples will be given later. But the purpose of the method is to train children to meet life's demands, to lead the child through a definite experience so as to fit him to encounter any fresh experience with confidence and in the spirit of Christ. So that the question of the teacher will not be, 'How am I to teach this Bible story?' but, 'How can I help John to be more thoughtful of others and to play the game?' The method is *indirect,* not by formal teaching of morals or religion, and not by ostensible expositions of the Bible. Children do not learn Christianity by being taught *about* it, but by *doing* it. 'There is nothing in the nature of ideas *about* morality, of information *about* honesty or purity or kindliness which automatically transmutes such ideas into good conduct or good character.' So one of the advocates of the new principle contends.

So much for theory. Take an example to make the idea clear. A boy in a class in school met with a serious accident. He was taken to the hospital and his seat was vacant next day. The teacher started a conversation about him and asked the children, 'What can we do for him while he is in hospital? What would he like?' Suggestions poured in—'a picture-book; a letter from the class; toys, fruit, flowers.' It was then decided that the class should provide these things, and the hour for religious instruction that day was spent in making a picture-book; next day there were toys to be made; next day a letter was written in collaboration; while every day some fruit appeared. And *then* the parable of the Good Samaritan was read by the teacher. It is contended that the children learned far more about religion and about service in that way than by formal lessons from the Bible.

The question naturally arises: how is the teacher to get these situations? A boy is not sent to hospital every day! No, but something is always happening. There are incidents in class life, the disappearance of money, occurrences in connexion with games, quarrels, challenges to truthfulness. But this is only one kind of situation. There are others. Something may happen in the parish—a vote on temperance, a sale of work for some good object. Or something may happen in church life. In Scotland, *e.g.*, it may be the time of the half-yearly celebration of the Lord's Supper. Here is a great opportunity to explain what it means and what place it has in Christian life. Or something big may be happening in national life—a General Election, a Health Exhibition, the League of Nations, a Report of the Food Council. Or, again, the newspapers may supply the situation—some happening about which everybody is speaking.

There have been several books published in America recently in support of this method, the most notable of which is Mr. Erwin L. Shaver's *The Project Principle in Religious Education.* He supplies literally hundreds of 'projects,' and one or

two may be selected in further illustration of the principle. In a certain town a child was run over and killed. The occurrence cast a gloom over the community. It was in the minds of all the children. This was the teacher's opportunity, a very difficult opportunity to use. Still, here was a real life situation, and one about which the children were asking their parents questions: 'Why did God allow that?' 'What had the child done to deserve that?' 'Why should she die so young?' It was a unique opportunity for a lesson on God's Providence and our free will. Here is another. In a certain school there was a refractory seven-year-old girl from an unfortunate home. The teacher often had her with herself after church, Sunday after Sunday, allowing the child to help her in various little ways. One day the child said: 'I know a little boy that can't come to Sunday School. He can't even go to school. He is lame and just sits in a chair. His mother is away almost all day, and the neighbours look after him a little. But he sits alone most of the time.' The teacher suggested she should take him some story papers, but the little girl replied, 'Oh, he can't read. He doesn't know *anything*.' Then the suggestion was made that the girl might tell him stories, to which she eagerly rejoined, 'Yes—why, I might teach him to read.' From this beginning grew a systematic effort on the little girl's part to share her knowledge with the boy. Patiently every day the little girl gave the lame child a lesson in reading, guided quietly by the teacher. The entire primary department was soon working together to enrich this shut-in life. Every Sunday some class made for him an extra copy of whatever expression work they had had that day. Whatever was given to the class, something of it went to the cripple. The little girl whose bad conduct had been a problem in the class became interested and helpful. Her character gradually changed, and it was actually learned later that the effect was seen in her own home. As a matter of fact, her mission to the lame boy had far-reaching results for him, for it led to medical aid which was to mean much to him for his health and vigour. But the point Mr. Shaver makes is that in this practical way the class, and more particularly the refractory girl, learned more for character and religion by this actual experience than they could by formal teaching of a Bible lesson. It is pointed out in further support of this method that this is how Jesus taught His disciples. They learned by seeing Him in actual situations and how He dealt with these. Jesus seldom gave formal teaching. He did things and said things and then explained them. He told the parable of the Sower, and then discussed it with His followers. And more than that, He taught them by sending them out to do the same things as He Himself was doing. They learned by doing. And when a lawyer asked Him a question as to who a 'neighbour' is, He told the story of the Good Samaritan, and then said to the lawyer, 'If you wish to know what it is to be a neighbour, go and do as this man did on the road to Jericho.'

It is only fair to point out that this method does not involve the disuse of our well-known methods. We still need to know how to tell a story; we still need to know how to ask questions and to answer them; we still need to know how to illustrate a Bible narrative. What is to be given up, if we are to follow the counsel of the advocates of this new method, is the day-by-day teaching of the Bible in school and the imparting of religious knowledge and ethical motive in this way.

What, then, is the value of the new method? Its supporters say it is not a method but a principle. But in reality it is a very definite method, and it is meant to supplant the regular teaching of the Bible in systematic fashion. It would be unfair to say that it scraps the Bible. The Bible is always used to reinforce the lesson of the situation. But the aim involves the abandonment of the custom prevalent in all our schools of the regular teaching of the Bible lesson and the giving of religious and moral training *through that*. What is to be said in favour of the new suggested method is obvious.

It is based on the sound maxim that 'We learn by doing.' And the examples already given show how effectively religion and conduct can be inculcated in this way. It is therefore clear we have something to learn from it. And I would suggest that the proper use of it would be as follows. When anything of a special nature or importance occurs in the life of the class or of the parish or of the nation, such as illness or accident to a pupil, or a local church event, or a national event of importance, or a world event like Amundsen's dash to the North Pole by aeroplane, the teacher might well give up the Bible lesson for that day and use the vital situation or event in which the children are

intensely interested as an instrument for a lesson of a special kind. The teacher should seize every such occasion and use it in the way suggested above. But it is a different matter altogether to be asked to give up the regular instruction by the daily Bible lesson. For one thing, the criticism directed against the ordinary teaching by syllabus of Bible narratives is excessive and misdirected. No Bible lesson is properly taught unless its permanent meaning for the soul and for life is made clear, and unless its practical bearing on the present lives of the children is made very real and urgent. And there is nothing that children love better in a well-taught Bible lesson than themselves pointing out in which ways the truth in a story bears on their own lives. The present writer was lately teaching a class of boys and girls of about eleven years of age in an East End school. The lesson was the Good Samaritan, and he elicited from the class parallels to it such as Nurse Cavell, Sir Philip Sidney, and Robert Louis Stevenson in Samoa. And when the children were asked what being a neighbour meant for them, they showered answers on the teacher: 'Helping a blind man across the road, running a message for a sick woman, looking after the baby,' and so on. But it must be said, in addition to this, that nothing can take the place of a system of teaching which makes the Bible familiar to a child and helps him to a true understanding of its progressive revelation. The weak point of the 'Projects' method is that it uses the Bible unsystematically just to illustrate whatever experience crops up. There may be large parts of the Bible which the children know nothing about, and they will know *nothing* of it as they ought to know, as a record of the progressive unfolding of the mind and will of God. I suggest, then, that teachers in our schools might well make more use of this method of teaching by actual situations, for there is no doubt that the surest and truest way of teaching any truth is by doing it. And in a parish the teacher may well use all kinds of agencies—boys' brigades, boy scouts, girls' guildry and guides, games, and all kinds of 'movements' for the training of his children in character. The occasional use of this method when the occasion fills the minds of the children with some urgent interest would add immensely to the ethical and religious efficiency of the religious education. But it will not and ought not to supplant or to set aside the regular and systematic and the intelligent and practical instruction by way of Bible teaching.

Judaism and Universalism in the Gospels.

By Professor C. J. Cadoux, M.A., D.D., Yorkshire United Independent College, Bradford.

II.

IV. The Universalism of Jesus.

The previous article set forth in full the evidence for what we may call the Judaism or particularism of Jesus. Deferring further study of it until we have all the material before us, we must now turn to the universalistic features in His life and teaching. We do not need here to treat 'Matthew' separately. All three Synoptic Gospels are here more on a level than in portraying the Jewish sympathies of Jesus: they were written when the world-wide mission of the Church was in full swing, and when there was constantly a tendency to magnify the Master's own universalism. Careful scrutiny, however, enables us to distinguish roughly between the truth and the exaggerations of it.[1]

(*a*) Common to all our sources is the representation that Jesus was profoundly influenced by the Old Testament in general, and by the prophetical books in particular; and the universalism to be found in the prophets could not have failed to leave its mark on His mind and teaching.[2] He addresses

[1] On the general subject, cf. Harnack, *Mission*, Eng. tr., i. pp. 36–38, 42; Mayor in *The Expositor*, Nov. 1899, pp. 385–399; A. T. Cadoux, *The Gospel that Jesus preached*, pp. 231–236. There is a Catholic monograph on the subject, replying to Harnack, by Max Meinertz, *Jesus und die Heidenmission* (Münster i. W. 1908: 2nd ed. 1925).

[2] Holtzmann, *N.T. Theol.*, i. p. 277.

God in prayer as 'Lord of the heaven and the earth' (Mt 11^{25}=Lk 10^{21} Q), and describes the Temple—in the words of Trito-Isaiah (Is 56^{7})—as 'a house of prayer for all the nations' (Mk 11^{17}: not the parallels; cf. Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. 40, note 1). He regards the mission of Jonah to pagan Nineveh as a sign of His own ministry (Mt 12^{39} 16^{4}= Lk $11^{29f.}$ Q), and contrasts the Ninevites and the Queen of Sheba with His fellow-countrymen as shining examples of religious responsiveness (Mt $12^{41f.}$=Lk $11^{31f.}$ Q). He quotes from Hosea (6^{6}) the anti-ritualistic oracle: 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice' (Mt 9^{13} 12^{7} M). The suffering Servant of the Lord, whom Jesus regarded as foreshadowing His own life (Lk 22^{37}), had been charged with a mission, not to Israel only, but to the Gentile world.

(*b*) Next, the teaching of Jesus is characterized by a broad moral humanism and individualism, in the presence of which any idea of excluding the Gentiles, or of confining Divine blessings to the Jews, seems irrelevant.[1] The disciple of Jesus is to love and serve his enemies and friends alike, with the same impartial magnanimity as God, the universal Father, shows in sending rain and sun (Mt $5^{43ff.}$=Lk $6^{27.35}$ Q?), to treat men generally as he would like them to treat him (Mt 7^{12}= Lk 6^{31} Q), and to be a fisher of *men* in the cause of the Kingdom (Mk 1^{17}=Mt 4^{19}; cf. Lk 5^{10}). The leaven of the parable permeates the whole lump (Mt 13^{33}=Lk $13^{20f.}$ Q). Jesus' own life is given as a ransom, and His covenant-blood poured out, on behalf of *many* (Mk 10^{45} ||, 14^{24} ||s)—striking reminiscences of the universalistic phrases of the great Servant-Poem (Is $52^{14f.}$ $53^{11f.}$). Broad human utterances resting on the sole authority of 'Matthew' are: 'Happy are the gentle, for they will inherit the earth' (Mt 5^{5}); 'Ye are the salt of the earth . . . ye are the light of the world' (Mt 5^{13-16}; Harnack, *loc. cit.*); 'Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth' (Mt 6^{10}); and, in the doubtful interpretation of the parable of the Tares, 'the field is the world' (Mt 13^{38}).

(*c*) Then, in the third place, we have Jesus' free and independent attitude to Scripture and the Law. He freely revised the dictates of the Mosaic Code, both ceremonial and moral, on His own authority (Mt $5^{21f.\ 27ff.\ 33ff.\ 38ff.\ 43ff.}$)—in particular, superseding the law permitting divorce (Mt $5^{31f.}$ 19^{1-11} ||s), cancelling the distinction between clean and unclean foods (Mk 7^{19}; cf. Mt 15^{17}), and refusing to participate in the legally specified punishment of an adulteress (Jn 8^{10}), or to encourage His disciples to fast (Mk 2^{18-22} ||s). His allusion, in the last connexion, to the new patch on the old garment and the new wine in the old wineskins is generally understood to mean that His dispensation as a whole could not possibly be combined or harmonized with Judaism. That is probably making too much of the passage; it is more likely that we have here simply a picturesque exposure of the unseemly incongruity of fasting in a season of rejoicing: but even so, the words express a claim to be free from the yoke of traditional legalism. Jesus did not display great zeal for the sacrificial system: God, He said, desired not sacrifice, but mercy (Mt 9^{13} 12^{7}). He preferred to describe the Temple as a house of prayer (Mk 11^{17} ||s) rather than of sacrifice. In His presence there was something greater than the Temple (Mt 12^{6}): it would one day be overthrown (Mk 13^{2} ||s; cf. Lk $19^{43f.}$), but He would speedily rebuild it (Mk 14^{58} ||, 15^{29} ||; Jn 2^{19}). He contended that the Messiah would not necessarily be a descendant of David.[2] He was often at issue with the religious authorities: He denounced the scribes and Pharisees, the champions of the legal tradition, for hypocrisy; the priests and Levites He pilloried in His story of the Good Samaritan. He provoked both classes into an attitude of deadly enmity to Himself. On the other hand, He called those who were oppressed by the yoke of the Law to come to Him for rest and relief (Mt 11^{28-30}; cf. 23^{4}=Lk 11^{46} Q?), and made Himself the friend of tax-collectors and sinners (Mt 11^{19}= Lk 7^{34} Q), *i.e.* of the folk of humble rank who could not be bothered to observe the myriad injunctions of the scribes. In regard to the Sabbath, He Himself ignored the scruples of the Rabbis, and was evidently not even prepared to observe and defend the precept: 'On it thou shalt do no work': He appealed rather to the broad principle that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath, and that therefore it was for man to say how he would use it (Mk 2^{23-28} ||s, 3^{1-6} ||s; Mt $12^{11f.}$=Lk 14^{5} Q; Lk $13^{15f.}$).[3]

[1] Holtzmann, *N.T. Theol.*, i. pp. 277–279; Stevens, *Theol. of New Test.*, p. 37.

[2] Mk 12^{35-37} ||s, a passage which even makes it doubtful whether Jesus regarded Himself as of Davidic descent.

[3] On the general question, cf. Heiler, *Katholizismus*, pp. 27–35, 268, with note 23.

(*d*) A still more positive and explicit universalism frequently appears to be in His mind.[1] Thus, at the Temptation, He sees all the kingdoms of the world as His prospective realm (Mt 4^{8} = Lk 4^{5} Q); and we must not interpret His refusal of the temptation to undertake the conquest of them as a sign that He abandoned interest in them and their politics. His address in the synagogue at Nazareth, with its references to Naaman the Syrian and the Sidonian widow (Lk $4^{25ff.}$: Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. p. 41, note 5), was so distasteful to the amour-propre of His Jewish audience that they hounded Him out of the building. He chose a Samaritan as a type of neighbourly love (Lk 10^{29-37}; Harnack, *ibid.*). The birds that roosted in the branches of the mustard-tree may possibly be a hint at the inclusion of Gentiles in the Kingdom (Mk 4^{32} ||s). The mission of the Seventy (Lk 10) is probably another hint, this time a practical one —seventy being the ideal Jewish number of all the Gentile nations (Gn 10; cf. Schürer, *Geschichte*, ii. p. 406 note [Eng. tr., II. i. p. 344—much briefer]; Montefiore, *Synoptic Gospels*, ii. p. 928). A well-attested saying recorded in Q runs: 'Many will come from east and west and north and south, and will recline (at table) in the kingdom of heaven with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; but the sons of the kingdom will be cast out into the outer darkness' (Mt $8^{11f.}$=Lk $13^{28f.}$).[2] On two occasions Jesus explicitly foretold the proclamation of the Gospel of the Kingdom to the Gentiles—in the great eschatological discourse (Mk 13^{10}=Mt 24^{14}, *i.e.* outside the limits usually given for the 'little apocalypse') and at the supper-table in Bethany (Mk 14^{9}=Mt 26^{13}). In neither of these cases have we any *documentary* grounds for doubting the accuracy of the report, though many scholars are unable to believe that such were really the words of Jesus.[3] Peculiar to 'Matthew' are the statements that the disciples would be taken before governors and kings 'for a testimony to them and the Gentiles' (Mt 10^{18}; contrast Mk 13^{9} and compare Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. p. 38, note 1), and the picture of the Last Judgment, at which Gentiles who have been kind to needy Christians are called to inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world (Mt 25^{31-46}). Allusion was made at the end of the first article to the difficulty of believing that Jesus explicitly enjoined on the disciples the evangelization of the Gentiles. Such injunctions —couched in very dissimilar words—are found in 'Matthew' ($28^{18f.}$), Luke ($24^{46f.}$), and the spurious ending to Mark ($16^{15f.}$). The divergence in the wording used, the prescription (in 'Matthew') of the Trinitarian baptismal-formula, the undoubted later tendency to refer customs of the Church to orders supposed to have been given by the Risen Christ, and finally, the delay in starting the Gentile mission and the opposition to it when started—all combine to make us doubt whether Jesus ever gave any such explicit instructions to the Twelve.[4]

(*e*) Whatever be the exact truth in regard to the theoretical universalism of Jesus, we observe that His practical universalism seems to have been generally subordinate to His personal mission to the Jewish people. The relevant incidents are easily enumerated. He does not shrink from travelling through Samaritan territory (Lk 9^{52}; cf. Jn 4^{4}): He cures a Samaritan leper (Lk 17^{11-19}; Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. p. 42 note). He cures the slave of a Gentile centurion in the service of Herodes Antipas at Kapharnaum, and declares that He has not found in any Jew such faith as the centurion had shown (Mt 8^{10}=Lk 7^{9} Q). The significance of the incident is a little affected by the probability that the man was a proselyte of some inferior grade, for he loved the Jewish race and had built them a synagogue (Lk 7^{5}). When once Jesus went on to predominantly Gentile soil, it was not in order to begin a Gentile mission, but probably to escape notice (Mk $7^{24f.}$; contrast Mt $15^{21f.}$). While He was there, the persistence of a Phœnician woman, begging His help for her afflicted daughter, overcame His hesitation, and He performed the cure (Mk 7^{28-30}=Mt $15^{27f.}$).[5] When we read in Matthew (15^{31}) that a crowd, seeing Him cure a number of sufferers, 'glorified the God of Israel,' the expression *may* imply that it was a Gentile crowd and that they were Gentile sufferers[6]: but this interpretation is not certain, and the unsupported statement of Matthew is insufficient to command one's belief. When He prayed: 'Father,

[1] Heiler, *op. cit.*, 33 f.

[2] Wendt, *Teaching*, Eng. tr., ii. pp. 347, 350; Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. p. 40, top.

[3] Wendt, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 349 note; Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. pp. 39–42.

[4] See the literature quoted at end of first art., THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, November 1926, p. 60.

[5] Wendt, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 347 f; Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. p. 39, top.

[6] See McNeile, *Matthew*, p. 232 f.

forgive them, for they know not what they do' (Lk 23^{34}), He probably had in mind the Gentile soldiers in the Roman army who were crucifying Him.

(*f*) There is one special phase of Jesus' universalism which has become clear only in comparatively recent times—I mean His concern over the feud between Israel and Rome. As Messiah He was to fill a *national* rôle: as one who included all the nations of the world in His sweep of vision, He must have been interested in the relations existing between Israel and all these other peoples: as one who claimed, and at first hoped, to win national obedience, He could not have ignored the most glaring and clamant Jewish problem of His day, viz. the struggle with Rome. His own personal example and His ethical teaching clearly reveal the solution He advocated. It was that by gentleness, goodwill, and religious leadership, Israel should change the suspicious tyranny of Rome and the contempt of the Gentile world into a peaceful fellowship, and should thus become the 'guide, philosopher, and friend' of mankind and the builders of a real and world-wide kingdom of God. The only alternative was a bloody fight to a finish. With the growing hostility of the Jewish leaders and the growing coolness of the rank and file, particularly at Jerusalem, Jesus watched the scales of history slowly inclining to the side of hatred and disaster. It must have become clear to Him at a fairly early date that certainly *all* the Jews would not become His followers. The early parable of the Sower shows Him realizing that all His seeds would not bear fruit, and the Marcan version of His subsequent explanations represents Him as speaking of 'those without' (Mk 4^{11}; but cf. McNeile, *Matthew*, 189 *b*). He pours forth His 'Woes' over the unrepentant Galilæan towns in which He had worked, declaring that the great heathen cities of the ancient world would at the Judgment incur a less terrible penalty than they (Mt 11^{20-24}=Lk 10^{13-15} Q). The point of the parable of the Great Feast (Lk 14^{16-24}=Mt 22^{1-10}) is that those for whom it was intended would forfeit their privilege because they did not value it: what they had scorned would be given to the despised outsider.[1] 'Matthew,' by adding a reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, shows only too well how clearly he had grasped the point: the king sends his armies and destroys those who had murdered his messengers, and burns their city (Mt $22^{6f.}$). The mournful sentence of exclusion begins as a threat, and finishes as a certainty. With heroic bravery, Jesus struggles to avert it. At one point in Luke's story we see the Messiah making His last agonized appeals to the nation to repent and abandon their policy of hatred before it is too late. The scene is probably Jerusalem.[2] First, He urges them to read the signs of the times, as they would study the weather (Lk $12^{54f.}$); then He pleads with them to be reconciled before their inexorable creditor claps them into hopeless prison (Lk 12^{57-59}). They try to rouse His patriotism by telling Him how Pilate had actually slaughtered some Galilæans at sacrifice; but He replies that, unless they repent, they will all perish likewise, and He thrusts His warning home with the parable of the barren fig-tree that was spared from destruction for one more brief year (Lk 13^{1-9}). But He saw that they would not change; and when later He rode into the city for the last time, He wept over it, and said: 'If only thou hadst known, in this thy day, the things that lead to peace; but now they are hidden from thine eyes. For the days will come upon thee when thine enemies will build a rampart round thee and surround thee and hem thee in on every side, and overthrow thee and thy children within thee, and will not leave one stone on another in thee—because thou didst not know the season of thy visitation' (Lk 19^{41-44}). In the controversies that ensued within the city, He told the Jews that the kingdom would be taken from them and given to others (Mt 21^{43}; cf. Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. 39, notes 2, 3), and urged them to pay the tribute that Rome demanded (Mk 12^{13-17} ||s). He told His disciples that Judæa would be overrun by foreign armies and the Temple destroyed (Mk $13^{2.\ 7f.\ 14-20}$ ||s). That, indeed, would not mean the final defeat of God's purpose. The King's supper-table would not lack guests.[3] Though the Temple be destroyed, He would rebuild it in three days—a cryptic pictorial allusion to His forthcoming triumph

[1] Though Harnack (*op. cit.*, i. p. 39, note 2) denies that Gentiles are here to be thought of.

[2] I have given full reasons for this suggestion, and have discussed the subject generally, in an article in *The Expositor* for March 1925, pp. 182–191. To the literature there cited I would add Holtzmann, *N.T. Theol.*, i. pp. 274–276, and Mess, *Studies in the Christian Gospel for Society*, pp. 19, 32, 189, 202 f.

[3] Cf. Wendt, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 346 f.; Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. p. 37.

(Mk 14^{58} ||, 15^{29} || ; Jn 2^{19}). But it did mean that Israel had finally refused the honourable task to which God had called her, and that she would reap the inevitable harvest in the miseries of a Roman conquest. It meant, too, that He Himself must die a criminal's death as the price of obtaining the Messianic crown He was destined to wear ; and the thought of His own sufferings mingled with that of His people's in one terrible picture of gloom. 'Daughters of Jerusalem ! weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and your children. For behold ! days are coming on which they will say, Happy are the barren, and the wombs which have not borne, and the breasts which have not nourished. Then will they begin to say to the mountains, Fall on us ; and to the hills, Cover us. For if they do these things when the tree is green, what will they do when it is dry ?' (Lk 23^{28-31}).

V. Conclusion.

In conclusion, it seems to me to be hopeless to search for a single formula that will combine both the Judaism and the particularism of Jesus in such a way as to prove His attitude to have been throughout uniform and consistent. The mind of the modern Christian naturally finds our Lord's universalism most intelligible and acceptable, and is tempted, either to ignore His Judaism, or to treat it as if it must have been in some way unreal, a kind of intentional pretence, solemnly kept up —no one knows why—because, in some mysterious way, so it had to be. That is to do violence to our records. The particularistic feelings of Jesus were real, not assumed ; nor can we argue that He laid them all aside towards the close of His ministry. Nor, I think, can we claim that Jesus Himself ever consciously, explicitly, and fully harmonized His Jewish loyalties with His world-wide sympathies. The dualism visible in this aspect of His ministry reminds us of the dualism visible in His treatment of Scripture. At one moment we find Him assuming that, if a commandment is found in the Pentateuch or an oracle in the Prophets, it is thereby clearly of Divine authority : at another moment, He boldly uses His own discretion to correct one Scripture by another, or to set it aside altogether. Where is the consistency ? A modern disciple may find a synthesis in the doctrine of the Inner Light ; but it is tolerably certain that Jesus never undertook to discover and explain such a synthesis Himself. So, too, with His Jewish and Gentile interests. He did not undertake to solve in advance all the problems which His ministry would suggest to later generations. The fire of His own instinctive religious life was kindled within the limits set by His Jewish parentage and racial traditions ; but it blazed and burned in this direction and in that as the breath of the Spirit of God might drive it, without staying for a consistent intellectual system to be worked out as each stage of its advance was reached. And yet we cannot doubt that the higher unity is really there for us to discover. Though we may not claim that Jesus ever in His earthly life laid aside altogether the strong particularism natural to every Jew, it is fairly clear that the universalism, which was *implicit* in His gospel from the very first, became more and more explicit and conscious and dominant as His ministry proceeded. It never, indeed, drove Him to leave the Jewish communities and begin a mission among the Gentiles within Palestine or without : it probably never moved Him to enjoin definitely such a mission on His disciples. But it did give Him a sublime ideal of His people's destiny—an ideal of world-service and leadership through religious enlightenment, an ideal fraught with inspiration for the Christian patriot of all ages. And it expressed itself in a magnificent campaign to induce His fellow-countrymen to pursue that ideal—a campaign which was defeated at one level of human experience only that it might issue in a still more glorious victory for God on a higher and more eternal level. It sprang from a fellowship with God so real—and a love for man so strong—that it was bound to force its way through the limits of even the broadest Judaism, and to spread out into that fair majestic growth whose leaves have been for the healing of the nations.

Entre Nous.

1927.

In addition to a number of articles on important subjects, contributed by experts, we have arranged for a series on 'The Faiths of To-day.' These will be dealt with from the inside, and the articles, besides stating the present-day position, will give the particular contribution to religious life which the individual forms of faith have made. We are to have also a short series on 'The Holy Spirit,' a subject which is specially in our minds at the present time. The articles will cover the Holy Spirit in the Bible, the Holy Spirit in the doctrine of the Church, and the Holy Spirit in the individual.

The Speaker's Bible.

It is many months now since we have drawn attention to *The Speaker's Bible*. In the interval three new volumes have been published, a volume on James, and two on St. Luke's Gospel. (St. Luke, Vol. III., and St. Luke, Vol. IV.). St. Luke, Vol. IV., completes the Gospel, covering the last five chapters with its great themes of Immortality, the Eucharist, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, and the Ascension. In this volume will be found extended treatment of topics such as 'The Permanent in Christ's Words,' 'Influence,' and 'Cross-bearing.' It contains many character studies also, and sermons on such subjects as the Poverty of Riches, the Easter Message, and the Difficulties of Unbelief. The Studies are illustrated from many fields of thought and from the most recent literature. The volume is quarto size and contains 260 double column pages, and the price is 9s. 6d. net. A specimen and prospectus may be had from 'The Speaker's Bible' Office, Aberdeen.

The Uplands of God.

A second collection, and, we regret, the last, of Mrs. Herman's devotional studies has just been published. The title is *The Touch of God* (James Clarke; 6s. net). Here are some of Mrs. Herman's thoughts on the Divine Uplifting. She tells the story of an Indian woman who sat at a desk in a mission school learning to write. 'She had been cruelly beaten by her relatives for going to school, but she persisted because she had a vision for her one-year-old boy. She wanted him to be a teacher, and determined that his own mother should help him with his lessons when he grew up. So she toiled patiently, filling sheet after sheet with cramped, clumsy, scrawling letters. "See!" said the enthusiastic missionary, showing the sheets to a friend. "See the lift at the end of each sentence—the way the words slant upwards! That's a symbol of the lift, the eternal mother-lift, which has raised us all out of the dust."'

It is the lift that makes the life. Does our religion lift us up? is the great test question.

It is unfortunately true, Mrs. Herman says, that we have learned to count melancholy, depression, brokenness of spirit, among the commonplaces of Christian life; and we 'tend to look upon them, not as grievous faults, but rather as the minor chords in the music of grace, the inevitable defects that accompany deep humility and contrition of heart. . . . But true contrition of heart has nothing in common with gnawing depression, and repentance is the dawn of deathless hope. Our initiation into the life of the Spirit is always an uplift. We are brought up out of a horrible pit and set upon the rock, and from that time onward our life-story is meant to be a song of ascents. There is an ascent that is evil, for the enemy of souls knows well how to counterfeit the ways of God in taking us up into a high mountain. But to stay in the valley because the Divine uplifting may be simulated is to yield to a more deadly temptation than any that can threaten us on the heights. To live on the flat is to sit down under the depressing shadow of self, a prey to a thousand deceptions. No soul can truly look on God without being raised to the uplands of life; and it belongs to the manliness of true humility to walk with face uplifted to heaven. Over the whole of our Christian life, and not merely over its beginnings, it should be written: "Jesus lifted him up, and he arose."

'The Divine uplifting spells *safety*. Our feet cannot slip on the uplands of God. Job speaks of God as one who exalts to safety those that mourn. The thought is somewhat startling. We should rather have described God as folding mourners in the arms of Divine consolation and leading them to springs of healing. That those who mourn are in danger, and therefore in special need of safety,

is an unfamiliar conception. Yet it is profoundly true to life. Sorrow often carries within it the possibility of deterioration. It surrounds the unwatchful soul with a relaxing, valetudinarian atmosphere. It is assumed that the sorrowing and the bereaved must sit apart, the passive recipients of sympathetic attentions. Out of such soft seclusion the miseries of self-importance and self-commiseration are born. The sorrow that should brace and purify becomes the raw material of self-deception. Prayer degenerates into the sterile pleading of self-pity. Temptations to sentimentality, exaggeration, eccentricity, peevishness, inconsiderateness spring up like mushrooms in the moist and misty air of the chamber of mourning. "Lift Thou me up to safety," must be the wise mourner's prayer.

'The Divine uplifting means *power*. For one man who is deliberately wicked, ten are tragically weak. Such weakness may be constitutional; but far more often it is merely the result of a drooping and dejected habit. The man who fixes his eyes upon the dust sees nothing but the drab, feeble, crawling things of life, and gradually grows into the likeness of what he sees.

'Nor is this state of infirmity confined to the unspiritual. There are many genuinely Christian folk, destined for far better things, whose eyes ever seek the ground, and who spend their days in running the small dust of life through their fingers.

'We are accustomed to speak of bending to God's will, when we should rather speak of raising ourselves up towards it!

> 'Thy wonderful, grand will, O Lord,
> *Triumphantly* I make it mine.

When that Royal Will becomes ours, there is an accession of power. Lifting up our eyes, we see Jesus only, and are made strong.

'The Divine uplifting brings *victory*. "He shall set me up upon a rock," exults the Psalmist, "and now shall mine head be lifted up above mine enemies round about me" There are two methods of spiritual warfare. We can stand on the battle-field and grapple with the enemy, or we can ascend to impregnable heights where no foe can reach us. But while each of the two methods is valuable in its own place, it is on the heights that our most triumphant conquests are won. We do bravely when we meet the foe on the field of danger; but how often there would have been no foe to fight, had we lived above the dust of battle!'

W. R. N.

The Seen and the Unseen: From the Religious Writings of W. Robertson Nicoll. So happy is the choice of extracts in this anthology that W. R. N. speaks to us in his most characteristic moods. As we read we almost hear that low, carrying whisper of his bringing out from rich stores thoughts on Work and Workers, Preachers and Preaching, Influence, Mystics and Mysticism, Comfort and Hope. Just before his passing he said, 'I believe everything that I have written about immortality,' and here one of the most suggestive sections is on Bereavement, Death, and the New Country. An attractive book is this anthology 'made by wife and daughter' (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net).

The Help of Saints.

'I always picture Christ standing between us and holding with His right hand so many of His believers and with His left hand so many. He merges us with them. They are in the full light, and we are in the twilight. But we both hold the hand of Christ, and constantly from the left hand to the right hand new souls are passing.'[1]

What is possible.

'It is by saving ourselves that we save others, and only so. Work out your own salvation: that is our first business. It is indeed the one business of life which is ours, our own. Nor could anything be shallower than the notion that this is selfish work.

'To be filled with the Holy Spirit is to be filled with power. It is to be uplifted, relieved, vitalised, so that all life and every word becomes an effectual ministry of the Gospel. We all know it.'[2]

The Faith of Robertson Smith.

'Professor Robertson Smith added in Aberdeen the accomplishment of preaching to his many other accomplishments. It was he who, addressing an evangelical meeting in the North Church, gave out for his text, "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest," and began: "He who spoke these words is present at our meeting to-night."'[3]

[1] *The Seen and the Unseen*, 186.
[2] *Ibid.*, 261. [3] *Ibid.*, 48.

NEW POETRY.

Kipling.

We have here another volume of Kipling's stories after a lapse of eight years. The publication of the volume—the title is *Debits and Credits* (7s. 6d. net)—by Messrs. Macmillan marks quite an event in the publishing year. There are fourteen stories in all, very varied in theme, but worked out in the way which this master of his craft so well knows how to do. Where all is good it were invidious to pick out any. But the delicate humour in Mr. Kipling's account of the secret society of the admirers of Jane Austen—The Janeites—is very delightful. That reminds us that there is an amusing slip in the verses on Jane's marriage:

Jane went to Paradise:
  That was only fair.
Good Sir Walter met her first,
  And led her up the stair.

But Jane Austen predeceased Sir Walter Scott by fifteen years. The volume contains not only stories, but also poetry. If you turn to 'We and They' you will find a more open-minded Kipling—not so sure of just those things of which he was very sure in earlier years.

Father, Mother, and Me,
  Sister and Auntie say
All the people like us are We,
  And every one else is They.
And They live over the sea,
  While We live over the way,
But—would you believe it?—They look upon We
  As only a sort of They!

But we select for quotation the poem on Concealment. It follows 'The Gardener,' the best story in the volume, with its unusual element of surprise. It is the history of a woman who had a son born out of wedlock. She concealed it, he passing for her nephew. When he was killed in the Great War she made a pilgrimage to see his grave, and One whom she took to be the Gardener said, 'Come with me, and I will show you where your son lies.'

One grief on me is laid
  Each day of every year,
Wherein no soul can aid,
  Whereof no soul can hear:
Whereto no end is seen
  Except to grieve again—
Ah, Mary Magdalene,
  Where is there greater pain?

To dream on dear disgrace
  Each hour of every day—
To bring no honest face
  To aught I do or say:
To lie from morn till e'en—
  To know my lies are vain—
Ah, Mary Magdalene,
  Where can be greater pain?

To watch my steadfast fear
  Attend my every way
Each day of every year—
  Each hour of every day:
To burn, and chill between—
  To quake and rage again—
Ah, Mary Magdalene,
  Where shall be greater pain?

One grave to me was given—
  To guard till Judgment Day—
But God looked down from Heaven
  And rolled the Stone away!
One day of all my years—
  One hour of that one day—
His Angel saw my tears
  And rolled the Stone away!

Lord Gorell.

Lord Gorell is already known, not only as a novelist but as a poet. A new collection of his poems, with the title *Many Mansions*, has just been published by Mr. John Murray (5s. net). The most important poem is a long one, giving a presentation of the life of our Lord as seen through the eyes of the Virgin Mary. It is wholly reverent and quietly effective. We quote one of the cantos:

Daybreak.

What joy, what peace he breathed into the world!
I cannot now remember, save I seem
To think myself a little child again—
A thought too difficult for my recapture—
How I pieced out the mystery of life
Before his coming: was it possible
That for so many ages men drew breath
So doubtfully, with dread of vengeance weighed,
A God of retribution overshadowing
Their timid paths of reverence? God is love:

For evermore that truth's simplicity
Makes music in the heart of all mankind.
O ecstasy of knowledge! Slowly, slowly
Its blessing flowered in us. Death's triumph died
Eternally: how strange it is to think
That it was ever for a moment's space
A darkness! But he understands the longing
That made us fear to know. Darkness and Death—
Shadows of ignorance! Self-created ghosts!

Eva Gore-Booth.

Evelyn Underhill has written a short introduction to *The House of Three Windows* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net)—a collection of Eva Gore-Booth's later poems—and in it she gives us a formula so that we may approach the lofty Christian mysticism of the poetry with understanding. The formula is 'Love.' 'This Love, for her, is "absolute sole Lord": not a "nice quality," but the essential character of reality, the hidden fact that is revealed in beauty. Only in its triumph can human life as she sees it become completely real.' With this in mind let us read 'The Disciple' and take too, for it is Christmas time, 'An Illuminated Missal':

THE DISCIPLE.

To stand at his side on the grass,
To take from his hand the broken bread
Of Beauty, and give it to all who come,
Crying out to the folk that pass,
'Here are the hills and the seas,
The fair flowers and the tall trees:
Take the Bread that all dreamers crave,
Waste not one delicate crumb,
Let not a rose-petal fall'—
Nay, better to say, 'In his name
I give you the spirit of all these things,
Here is love that is flowers, love that is wings,
Life like a dancing flame,
Life like a singing wave,
Truth strong-rooted as hills and trees,
All these are love, all these,
God over all, and in all.'

AN ILLUMINATED MISSAL.

Here all men come to the centre of things,
Angels, and shepherds, and travel-worn kings.

Such a bright procession never was seen,
Amongst the Kings there's a crownèd Queen.

Long hair falling on a brown dress,
In the midst of the shepherds a shepherdess.

Breathless and joyful in rapturous awe
All the grand people kneel down in the straw.

Ivory sceptres and robes of pride,
Humbly the kings have cast them aside

To journey o'er miles of desert sand
Into the heart of the Beautiful Land.

By the light of a star they found their way
From what far country no man can say.

But the shepherds were humbler, light shone on them,
For they pastured their flocks near Bethlehem.

And the Ox and the Ass were the humblest of all,
So Christ himself has come to their stall.

Dumbly they gaze with round eyes undismayed
At the Radiant Love in their manger laid.

Whilst Mary smiles in her robe of blue
And whispers, 'The Lord has need of you.'

Round the border, primroses blossom sweet
And a grasshopper lies at the Virgin's feet.

There are bees and roses and berries red,
All crowding into the little grey shed,

Where under the Light of the New Star
The Child smiles Peace on All Things That Are.

Erratum.

In a recent review a printer's error escaped correction. Kindly note that the title of the Rev. Frank Cox's volume should be *The Mastership of Jesus*. It is published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Probably everybody except the confirmed and incurable pessimist begins the New Year with hope. We look forward to a year that will be better than 'the years wherein we have seen evil.' This is an attitude characteristic of the Old Testament, which looks steadily forward to the better thing that 'is to come to pass in the after-days.' History is both 'purposive and adventurous,' and the Hebrew prophets contemplated 'an ever-widening ideal, which does not exist complete in the mind of the individual nor in the mind of the generations, but is always ahead.' That ideal was the Torah of Jahweh, not indeed the legal and ritual Torah, but the Torah in its strict and proper sense of direction, 'the direction of Jahweh, the living God.'

The sentences quoted are taken from a recently published book by Major J. W. Povah, B.D., in *The Old Testament and Modern Problems in Psychology* (Longmans; paper covers, 3s. net; cloth, 5s.). Many of the pronouncements of the New Psychology need, and will no doubt in time receive, revision and modification, but it is undoubtedly a science that has come to stay, and it will have to be reckoned with; indeed, it has already grappled, not quite unsuccessfully, with such phenomena as the visions occasionally associated with the prophetic call, with ecstasy, and the like. It is all to the good that, in the light of modern knowledge, scientific students of the Bible should attempt to make those ancient experiences intelligible; and Major Povah seems to have made this province of study peculiarly his own. He has already given us a small book on 'The New Psychology and the Bible,' and a larger one on 'The New Psychology and the Hebrew Prophets,' a book in which he had many illuminating things to say on the prophetic experience of Hosea.

In this new book he discusses, from the standpoint of the psychologist, some questions of immense interest to the student of prophecy—not only the visions of the prophets, but the distinction between true and false prophecy, and that fascinating and almost insoluble problem of the attitude of the pre-exilic prophets to public worship. But his interest is very far from being exclusively theoretical; he deals with such eminently practical topics as the Principles of Old Testament Sociology, while his concluding chapter is on The Prophets and To-day. It is further characteristic of his careful method, which explores all the relevant facts, that his opening chapter is on the Hebrew Language.

For he rightly believes that we have much to learn of the Hebrew mind from a consideration of the Hebrew language and Hebrew grammar; he believes this indeed so earnestly that he would wish to see the study of Hebrew made 'an essential part of the training of all who are being prepared to become teachers and "spiritual pastors" in the Church.' He will be glad to know that, so far as

Scotland is concerned, this hope of his has been realized long ago, the Hebrew language as well as Old Testament literature being an integral part of the curriculum in the theological colleges.

His treatment of the familiar construction known as the 'waw consecutive' is highly suggestive. He shows that behind it lies the desire of the writer or speaker to move forward with his experience, carrying it all, as it were, with him: he does not jump from one stepping-stone to another, but he swims from one to another with the stream of his narrative. While fully admitting the remarkable deficiencies of the Hebrew language, it is yet possible to maintain that this particular feature of it encouraged the contemplation of the interrelation of facts and of the inevitableness of that relation of cause and effect on which Amos laid supreme stress. It was a language singularly well adapted for the work which the Hebrew writers had to do.

The chapter on Mythology which follows is scarcely so convincing, and illustrates the danger to which all highly specialized study is exposed. The symbolism of the Old Testament is explained in ways which will not commend themselves to the student of comparative religion as readily as they do to the psychologist. The cup is said to denote receptivity and to be a symbol of submission, willing or unwilling. That may be. But when we are told that the rod-serpent—of Moses, *e.g.*—is a libido symbol, we begin to wonder. The serpent into which the rod was turned when thrown upon the ground is symbolic of 'a grovelling and horrible libido,' and Moses in fleeing from it, was trying 'to run away from his own instincts.' The catching of it by the tail and the lifting of it up from the ground indicate the sublimation of the energy; 'the very libido from which he had fled in terror became available for the work to which Jahweh was calling him.'

So the fiery serpents which bit the people symbolize the libido or energy turning backwards, flinching from the task set by Jahweh; and the cure lay not in the extinction of the libido, but in the direction of it forwards to an ideal. This seems more interesting and subtle than probable.

But whether we agree with these interpretations or not, the idea which they embody is a valuable one, and one to which Major Povah recurs more than once. He maintains, *e.g.*, with much plausibility that sin, even when it seems to be positive, is often rather a matter of omission than of commission. Israel's sin in the wilderness was just a great refusal to face up to Jahweh's ideal; to the prophets sin consisted primarily just in that omission, or rather in that refusal to face reality, and the excessive devotion of the people to the ritual worship of their God was just a 'defence reaction' against facing Him in the realm and in the demands of moral reality.

Of great importance is the question raised by Major Povah whether the prophets had any peculiar psychological equipment for their work, and he answers it with a decided affirmative. There were many loyal servants of Jehovah contemporary with them, men like Josiah, Baruch, Nehemiah, but psychically the prophets stand in a different category: they had a psychical constitution, he maintains, which in any age would be regarded as decidedly abnormal. It was through an 'abnormal' psychical experience that a man like Amos was first led to preface his message with the words, 'Thus has Jahweh said.' But it has to be remembered, as Major Povah reminds us, that it is not this psychical abnormality that constitutes their inspiration, but the content and the ethical quality of their message, and its appeal to the highest moral aspirations of mankind. Otherwise we should have to predicate inspiration of the prophets who are ordinarily described as false, the prophets who were at the mercy of mass suggestion and who mistook for divine inspiration the spontaneous outbursts of their own unconscious minds.

Another hotly debated question is the relation of the prophets to the cult, and the writer has made it clear that the early prophets were closely connected with the sacrificial system. This is very

plain in the case of Samuel, and scarcely less so in the case of Elijah who defended the cause of Jahwism at the altar on Carmel. But in the case of the great pre-exilic prophets Major Povah rightly maintains that the question of their attitude to sacrifice can hardly be answered with certainty. There were elements in the cult, like praise and prayer, of which they could hardly have disapproved, and their seeming condemnation of the cult can hardly have extended to these features of it. But the writer leans to the view that the prophets believed in a God who 'did not want sacrifice, he wanted righteousness and nothing else'; and, significantly enough, the false prophets who come under their lash are usually found in association with the priests.

Another vital question raised by the book relates to the sociological aspect of the Old Testament. The prophets, it is universally admitted, pleaded with unsurpassed earnestness for justice, mercy, and truth. But has the Old Testament nothing more to offer than these general principles? Has it no specific guidance, *e.g.*, as to the proper attitude to private property, war, and similar institutions, as to whose legitimacy some good men may be in doubt to-day? And the gravity of this question is enhanced when we pass from the prophets to our Lord. Did He do nothing more than reiterate the prophetic demand for justice, mercy, and truth? Did He give specific guidance of such a kind as to be a really practical contribution to the solution of our modern problems?

On these questions Major Povah has thoroughly useful things to say. He directs attention to definite Old Testament teaching on the subject of the sex and the parental instincts, and points out that its sociology calls not for their eradication, but for their discipline. He calls attention to the fact that not only is private property nowhere denounced by the Old Testament, but that it is positively presupposed as an inherent principle of its sociology. And he further reminds us of what we too easily forget, that the teaching of Jesus has a broad Old Testament background, and that His silence may often be fairly interpreted as indicating His tacit agreement with its general sociological principles, accepted as they were by His hearers as well as by Himself, and therefore in no need of explicit re-emphasis.

There are many other suggestive things in this valuable book, points which may be gratefully accepted, and points which may be challenged. Among the latter may be mentioned the writer's attitude to Messianic prophecy. He thinks that, in the case of certain great utterances, 'for all we know to the contrary, the prophets themselves may hardly have known what they did mean.' This we believe to be rather dangerous ground to take. There is, of course, this obvious measure of truth in the contention, that great men often speak better than they know. As the ages roll on, their words acquire a deeper meaning with the ever-widening and deepening experience of men. But even though they were the submissive instruments of a great cosmic Purpose, they were intelligent and willing instruments, and we should be sorry to think that they themselves hardly knew what they meant.

But this does not prevent us from acknowledging the justice of Major Povah's argument that their visions may have come to the prophets as the result of a period of subconscious thinking. It is in the discussion of the subconscious element of the prophetic experience that the interest of his discussion largely lies. But he is well aware that the subconscious does not explain everything, and that in religion the intellect must come to its own; and not the least service of the book is to remind us that the Church is suffering, as he bluntly puts it, from the repression of the intellect, and that 'any extensive revival of interest in the normal modes of public worship will have to be preceded by an extension of adult religious education.'

The question of our Lord's teaching on the future destiny of man has been raised again by an excellent study of His actual words by an earnest and able layman, Mr. J. H. Brown—*Eternity:*

Is It a Biblical Idea? (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net). Farrar and Cox made heroic efforts in an earlier generation to show that Jesus' teaching referred not to the duration of life so much as to its quality. Their writings gave expression to the larger hopefulness which was really created by the fresh discovery of Jesus and His teaching about God. And the acceptance it met with was due rather to this spirit than to its success in exegesis. Indeed, sound scholarship seemed to frown upon that exegesis, and Mr. Brown agrees with this critical judgment.

Opinion on the question at the present time seems to have swung round to the theory of conditional immortality which has been advocated lately in a number of books, notably one by Professor Pringle-Pattison. But Mr. Brown will have none of this. He thinks the theory unworthy of God, and of man as well, and clears it out of his way at the start.

In an introductory essay he discusses general theories and comes to the conclusion that 'the irrevocable determination of the individual's destiny at death' is difficult to reconcile with the justice of God. But if this be so, he asks, how shall we account for those sayings of Christ which seem to afford good ground for the doctrine? We read of a 'great gulf fixed,' of a place called 'Hell,' or 'Gehenna,' where 'their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched,' of 'eternal punishment' and of 'the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels.' Is not the conclusion forced? It is, says the writer, if we take the words of those passages from the Revised Version as truly reflecting His meaning.

It is true that a large allowance must be made for the frequent use of parable and metaphor in the teaching of Jesus, and also for the fact that He made use of popular notions and beliefs of the time. It is agreed also that the Scriptures were written in popular, not scientific, language. And, finally, it is urged that a question of such terrible import can hardly be decided on the meaning of 'a mere Greek adjective.' Still, making all allowance for such considerations, the writer does not find them conclusive. There remain our Lord's many words, and especially His use of the word *aiōnios*. And for the author of this study the question seems to hang largely on the meaning of this word. If the word *aiōnios* were rendered by some word which did *not* mean endlessness, then very few unbiassed English readers would, he feels, come to the conclusion that our Lord taught the doctrine of endless punishment.

Accordingly he bravely embarks on an inquiry into the meaning of this word. And his conclusions are these. The word has far more a Hebrew ancestry than a Greek, and when it is interpreted in the light of its Hebrew ancestry it refers to hidden rather than endless time. He admits it refers to duration and not mere quality of being (it was here Farrar made his mistake). But he is convinced that 'ages-lasting' is a better equivalent than 'everlasting.' The idea is that of time fading into the dim distance and undetermined. This conclusion is reached after a searching examination of every variation of phrase to be found in Scripture.

It may be conceded that the author has proved his point. His argument and exegesis would be difficult to upset. And it may be admitted that the conclusion is important. But is it decisive? One question he has, so far as we have noticed, left unanswered. Supposing all this true, how would Jesus have *said* that punishment is to be endless otherwise than by the words He has used? Was this not the only way He could possibly take to say it if He meant it? Further, though it must be admitted that to prove *aiōnios* to mean not endless but *possibly* something less is to remove something of a nightmare from our minds, does it quite dispel the nightmare? Is not a dim, distant, age-long prospect pretty nearly the same thing as endlessness?

The conclusion in this book is likely to bring comfort to minds that are divided between hope and fear. But surely the grounds to-day of the 'larger hope' are broader than any mere linguistic conclusion. They rest on the Fatherhood of God

and on such large conceptions of Jesus as are expressed in the Good Shepherd seeking His sheep *until He finds it*. Still, this inquiry has its own vital importance, and the writer has conferred a distinct benefit on the students of the New Testament by his thorough, able, and searching study on a topic of perennial interest.

The Thirteenth Conference of Modern Churchmen was held at Girton College, Cambridge, in September. The subject was 'Sacraments: Their Psychology and History'; and the October number of the *Modern Churchman* is published with this title and contains the papers read at the Conference (Blackwell; 3s. 6d. net). There are eighteen papers, dealing with every aspect of the subject—historical, scriptural, and dogmatic. The writers are most of them well known, Canon NAIRNE, Professor Percy GARDNER, Archdeacon LILLEY, Canon Guy ROGERS, among others. This fat number of the well-known magazine contains a great deal of learning and a great deal of modernity, and the views ably expressed here will have to be reckoned with by serious scholars.

Most people will turn first to two articles which contain the real issue: 'Sacraments and the Synoptic Gospels,' by Dr. Douglas WHITE, and 'The Value of the Sacraments To-day,' by Canon T. Guy ROGERS. We confess to disappointment with the former. Its gist may be expressed by saying that there is no real evidence that Jesus directed the Lord's Supper to be perpetuated; but that does not really matter. It remains a very special means of sacramental grace, wherein we may reach communion with and participation in the Spirit of Christ. It is likely that many will feel themselves satisfied with this somewhat nebulous assurance. But it is quite certain that very many will desire a more thorough and informed discussion. Dr. WHITE does not seem to be aware of the strength of the case for our Lord's institution of the Lord's Supper or of the probable reason why the command to perpetuate it is confined to St. Luke.

A much more satisfying treatment is given us by Canon Guy ROGERS in dealing with the Value of the Sacraments to-day. He entirely differs from Dr. WHITE in his view of the historical facts, and he presents the evidence for the traditional view with cogency. He admits that the logion in Luke, 'Do this in remembrance of me,' is doubtful, but the belief in our Lord's authority for the observance of the Supper does not rest on that. It rests on two facts of very great significance, especially when taken together. The first is Paul's statement that the command to observe the Supper came to him from Christ Himself. Is there any real ground to question a definite assertion like that?

But this evidence is rendered even more persuasive by the fact that from the very first the Supper was held regularly by the followers of Jesus. In itself that might not be conclusive. But, when you have a clear statement of a fact by Paul and find it backed by the custom of the early Church, the evidence does seem to be conclusive, and, if so, the fact is not so indifferent as Dr. WHITE would suggest. It does mean a very great deal to Christians that this central act of worship is one Jesus commanded, and that it comes to them, not as a device of the Church (however useful), but from the Lord Himself.

'It is very strange,' writes Dr. WHITE, 'if in none of the gospels is there any record of the institution by Christ of a rite which came to be regarded as the principal and most necessary means of spiritual life and progress.' On the other hand, it is not so strange when one realizes that the observance of the Supper had been going on for thirty or forty years before the earliest gospel appeared. It was an established and familiar custom, a part of Church life and worship, and it has been suggested with some probability that what the Synoptics give us is the formula used by the ministers in dispensing the Sacraments. And, though John does not record the institution, he admittedly implies the actual practice of the sacramental rite as being observed in his day.

Canon Rogers goes on to deal with the theological value of the Sacraments, and with their human value. As to the former, having repudiated the Catholic view, he proceeds to vindicate the spiritual influence of the Supper. It brings to us a wider and more satisfying experience than any other by which God through Christ 'graciously' finds His way into our personalities. And he rejoices that in this way congregations are rendered independent of the vagaries and idiosyncrasies of individual clergy!

And as to the human value, 'the Sacraments testify to the world the value that the Christian religion sets on man. God calls him to Himself, communicates to him His own divine nature, spreads for him His feast of love. He does not do so in virtue of any particular position, wealth, prestige, power of education which the particular man possesses, but just because he is a man.' The Christian cannot regard any man as 'cheap.' He means too much to God. Hence all that concerns him—his housing, wages, standard of life, his recreation, and his worship—counts for much. No greater service, then, could the Church do for the world to-day than to present to men the social consequences of its own sacramental faith.

Some Tendencies and Problems in Modern Theology.

By the Reverend C. J. Wright, B.D., Penzance.

Theology may be regarded as the intellectual statement of our Faith, the reasoned endeavour to set forth the verities of Religion. Let it be remembered that Theology, while indispensable to Religion, is not itself Religion. For, on the one hand, Religion is experience, and Theology is the endeavour to think coherently about experience. Yet, on the other hand, Religion never exists in isolation from thought; in every experience there is an intellectual element. Besides which, man's persistent effort is to co-ordinate his experiences into an intellectually-satisfying whole. As long as man is religious he will require a theology.

It will, I suppose, be agreed that in this generation Theology is at a considerable discount among educated people. Publishers tell us of the financial gamble involved in bringing out a book on Theology containing, say, the number of words that would be considered adequate for a modern novel. The average intelligent person seems to have little or no interest in what used to be regarded as 'the Queen of the Sciences.' Even ministers of religion, it may be said, have ceased to have a dominant interest in Theology. The financial difficulty is not the sole, or even the main, explanation of this state of affairs, for most people can afford to buy what they really want. Many regard Theology, with unhappy recollections of College days, as a bore.[1] Others regard it, sceptically, as a futile ploughing of the sands. Let us concentrate, so I have heard it frequently said by ministers of religion, on the practical tasks of life, and leave these speculative questions about which there is so much, and increasing, uncertainty. A proportion of the others, intensely concerned with theological problems, have been driven to believe that little in the way of enlightenment is to be looked for from the professional teachers. And certainly it is difficult to avoid the acknowledgment that the persistent evasion of issues by the theologians is responsible for the fact that many now look for the illuminating word to various literary dilletanti in Theology. If, for example, Mr. H. G. Wells should choose to say anything about such matters, widespread interest is aroused, and the numerous references from pulpit and religious press seem to indicate the belief that now, at long last, something important has been said.

This state of affairs I cannot but regard as a great menace to the future of Religion. If Religion cannot be stated in terms of coherent thought, its future is in considerable jeopardy. A religion divorced from reason can as little meet the needs

[1] I do not here speak for myself, for I have nothing but a deep feeling of indebtedness to my own theological teachers.

of humanity as a science divorced from religion. Nor is this to suggest that any theological statement or system can be adequate to the infinite and transcendent reality with which it deals. 'Le dieu défini, c'est le dieu fini.' All our statements are partial and, in a measure, transitional; they endeavour to compass a reality which by its very nature is beyond our utmost powers. The theologian in his occasional religious moments is overwhelmed by the consciousness of the inadequacy of his best efforts. It is a familiar story that the great Aquinas himself, whose *Summa* has come to be regarded by many of his theological 'followers' as the final and all-sufficient word in these matters, declared towards the end of his life after an experience of religious ecstasy: 'What I have written now seems as straw.' Perhaps, however, it is well that the mystic vision is not a constant experience: otherwise we should, from a misguided sense of reverence, relinquish the necessary task of theological explication. The sense of the inadequacy of our theologies should be a spur and not a check. If ever the day should come when through an excess of mystic fervour all the religious people of the world should desist from the task of apologetic statement, by that very act they would be dealing a mortal blow to the future of religion in the world. People might for a time by the impetus of habit and tradition continue to perform 'religious acts,' but sooner or later the impetus would be negatived—just as the railway coach when 'slipped' from the train sooner or later comes to a standstill. A revived interest in theology is, I believe, one of the first needs of the Church to-day.

But a revived interest in what theology? There's the rub. The decaying interest in theology, it will certainly be replied, is in large measure caused by the quite obvious inacceptability of past statements. These, it is continually declared, belong to an era of thought which the age has left behind. They are monuments of the endeavours of past Christian ages to set forth in their own philosophic *media* the verities of religion. While, therefore, they are not to be lightly set aside, they are not to be regarded as finally authoritative for an age which cannot use such *media*. They are to be esteemed as the servants of our thought, and not to be submissively acquiesced in as the despots of our thought.

This standpoint ought, I think, to be cordially accepted. The right of theological restatement will be recognized by all who believe in that Spirit of God whose function it is to guide us into the truth. No Creed, Council, Confession, or Standard should be regarded as having said the last word. The infallibilities have all gone, and whether we wish it or no we are left with the inescapeable task of restatement. For our enheartenment we may remind ourselves that, while the age pays scant respect to our traditional apologetics, it is intensely interested in religion and its problems. It is, perhaps, sufficient to point to the fact that our daily and weekly Press finds articles dealing with serious religious issues very good 'copy.' Most preachers, further, have found that the sermons which awaken keenest interest and for which they receive the most heartfelt expressions of thanks are those in which they have tried to deal with the 'great' questions in a large and untrammelled way.

Every one is familiar with the two terms which to-day tend to divide theologians into two camps. They are Fundamentalism and Modernism. Perhaps I may be permitted to say something about them.

I confess at the outset that I have no great love for labels. They are, I suppose, necessary, but they tend to the perpetuation of feuds. Labels tend also to the stereotyping of thought. Even those movements of thought and life which led to the emancipation of the human mind and spirit became, through this labelling process, inimical to the very liberties they secured. If we must have banners to fight under, let us see that they *move*, and we with them.

Fundamentalism.—All of us wish to be 'fundamentalists': the only question that arises is, What are we to regard as 'fundamentals'? This great term has come, unhappily, to be almost a synonym for a certain type of theological obscurantism which has its temporary home, or fortress, in America. It would be a great mistake to imagine that all America is, if I may change the figure, following this banner; yet it is, I think, true that apart from certain Eastern States, America is theologically where we were in this country fifty or sixty years ago. The impartial historian will not be surprised at the present theological situation in that country. The stupendous task of subjugating Nature which has occupied the Middle-West and West can hardly be considered conducive to general intellectual progress, nor does the quest for money usually co-exist with the quest for truth. We cannot have more Gods than one.

To return to this so-called 'Fundamentalism.' It seems in the highest degree unfortunate that a

word such as this should be used to label views which have about as much stability as the drifting sands. Remembering our Lord's parable, I cannot but think that those who teach people to build their faith on such are doing the greatest possible disservice to the cause of religion. The term covers the greatest diversity of beliefs, but the one 'foundation' belief seems to be the 'infallibility' of our Scriptures. From this belief, or rather from the attitude of mind which makes possible the retention of this belief, all the rest follows—the repudiation of the scientific theory of Evolution, the construing of the Divinity of our Lord through the notion of Omnipotence and Omniscience, the equating of religion with theology, etc. In a recent volume of American apologetics, I find the following statement: 'We have been represented sometimes as though we were requiring an acceptance of the infallibility of Scripture—from those who desire to become Church members, whereas in point of fact we have been requiring these things only from candidates for ordination.'[1] I can only say that if the belief referred to were ever to be established as essential for candidates for ordination, a most effective step would have been taken to secure the cessation of the Christian ministry.

Modernism.—Every one knows that the term was originally employed to denote a movement within the Roman Church. Pius x. launched his Encyclical 'Pascendi Gregis' against certain thinkers and scholars of his own communion whom he styled 'Modernists.' Many of them were excommunicated by the Church which they declared it was their sole aim to serve. Some of them, to their own ecclesiastical undoing, had drunk too deeply of the spirit of Him who in the interest of Truth had suffered the opprobrium and condemnation of Authority.

With the official death of 'Modernism,' the term now seems to belong to the theologically-progressive section of the Church of England, though some of them, notably Dean Inge, are not very favourably disposed to its use. The term has, however, I imagine, come to stay. It is coming to be welcomed by thinkers and scholars outside the Anglican communion. Dr. Frank Ballard, in a recent number of the *London Quarterly Review*, wrote under the title 'Modernism as a Refuge and Dynamic.' In similar spirit Dr. R. F. Horton has recently, in the pages of the *Congregational Quarterly*, called upon the thinkers in the Free Churches to establish a Conference of Modernist Free Churchmen with aims and ideals similar to those of the Modern Churchmen in the Church of England.

[1] J. G. Machen, D.D., *What is Faith?* 157.

What is Modernism? It is impossible to define it succinctly in a sentence, unless indeed we approach it from the standpoint of fundamental hostility. Pius x. had no difficulty in characterizing it. 'Modernism,' he declared, 'was the synthesis of all the heresies.' Another has declared flippantly: 'Modernism, like Latitudinarianism, is based on a tendency—the tendency to be up to date.' To which the obvious answer is that it is better to be up to date than out of date—and, let me add, better to know the secret of the dateless than either.

Turning now from the utterances of avowed opponents of Modernism, let me give a few characterizations from its sympathisers and protagonists. 'To believe that the present is fuller, older, and wiser than the past which it incorporates and transcends is in every age to be a Modernist,' said Father George Tyrrell. The same writer declared that Modernism was 'an attempt to reconcile the essentials of Catholic faith with those indisputable results of historical criticism which are manifestly disastrous to the mediæval synthesis of scholastic theology.' Dr. Sanday, of revered memory, towards the end of his life welcomed the term 'Modernist' and that for which it stood. He wrote: 'The name describes justly what I aim at being. I aim at thinking the thoughts and speaking the language of my own day, and yet, at the same time, keeping all that is essential in the religion of the past.' 'The great aim of the Modernist quest,' said the same writer, 'is the unification of thought.' A great quest, indeed, but one which the Modernist, while entering upon in faith, has not the intellectual immodesty to declare is within reach of present attainment.

Let me now turn to the three dominant features in the present position of thought which are determining the tendencies, and the problems, of modern theology. Within the confines of this paper these can only be briefly referred to. They are (1) The Comparative Study of Religion, (2) The Historical and Literary Criticism of the Books which compose our Bible, and (3) The Conclusions and Presuppositions of Natural Science. It is difficult to say which is primary in order of importance. The three together constitute the present and future task of the Christian theologian. They are at once his opportunity and his problem.

First, *the Comparative Study of Religion.* It may, I think, be said that the *scientific* study of the non-Christian religions is one of the glories of

the past two or three generations of Western thought. I say *scientific*, for while in all ages there have been thinkers and travellers who sought to appreciate sympathetically phases of religious thought and practice however diverse from their own, yet the study has been generally and impartially embarked upon only from about the middle of the last century. Many great names occur at once to the mind, but perhaps it is sufficient now to stress the debt we owe to the pioneers. Names such as those of Max Müller, Robertson Smith, and E. B. Tyler remind us of our debt to those who launched out with faith and hope upon those studies. To-day in nearly all theological colleges and halls a place in the curriculum is given to the comparative study of religion—even when, as may sometimes be the case, the knowledge and point of view imparted in the lecture-room tend to the undermining of the dogmatic foundations which it is sought to lay in the theological lecture-room. It is inevitable in the present state of transition that the two subjects should be treated separately. The day, however, must come when the unity, or at least the interdependence, of the two will be generally recognized. For, on the one hand, the study of theology must embrace a study of *all* manifestations of religion; and, on the other, the study of religions cannot be divorced from the consideration of those ultimate issues raised by Christian theology in its long history.

The impact of the study upon Christian theology, however, is beginning to manifest itself with emphasis. The labours of the students have been gradually filtering down to the general religious mind of the West, and the day is almost here when the questions which arise will have to be answered. It is well to note that every new study passes through two main phases. First, what I may call the scientific, and, second, what I may call the philosophic. The first is concerned simply with the facts: the second is concerned with the bearing of these facts upon our previous statements. The second phase of the comparative study of religion is almost, if indeed not already, here. This is, without doubt, the more difficult phase; it presents the more central of problems. This is one of the tasks of future theology. I have not the temerity, nor, I trust, the immodesty, to suggest all that the application of the results of this study will involve for theology. I may, however, be permitted to indicate one or two results and problems.

The first result is, that the old distinction of religions into *true* and *false* has gone for ever. This distinction seems to have been widely accepted until well on into and through the nineteenth century. Even David Hume, foremost of sceptics, indicated his acceptance of the distinction, or at least felt himself on solid ground in utilizing the distinction, in his famous *Enquiry*. No one, however, now writes or speaks of any religion as either wholly true or wholly false. There is some good and some truth in the worst, and some bad and some superstition in the best. It is not necessary for me to apply this consideration to the religion we regard as the highest and best, it being at least obvious that all who call themselves Christians distinguish according either to their denomination or school of thought between what they regard as the essential truth of Christianity and certain unessential, or mistaken, manifestations.

It would not be difficult, I think, to show that this sympathetic appreciation of the gropings of the diverse races after God is true to the New Testament mind and spirit. In accord with the Christology of the author of the Fourth Gospel we may regard the religions of mankind as having received whatever 'light' is in them from Him who is the 'light of the world.' St. Paul, in his address at Lystra, reminded the Gentiles that God had never left Himself without a witness among them. God, said the writer of *Hebrews*, spoke to those of old 'by divers portions and in divers manners.' It is not necessary to stress the point further.

Another result, if I may here speak for myself, is a more certain appreciation of the supremacy of the life and teaching of Jesus. The fear has haunted many minds that the comparative study of religions would remove Christ from the position of pre-eminence in which He has been placed by Christendom. Doubtless the question goes down to deeps of the type of Incarnation theory we maintain. But, from the mere standpoint of History, it may, I think, be said that what we know of other founders of religions gives to us a surer conviction of the pre-eminence of the Founder of Christianity. It would not be difficult to compile a list of quotations from non-Christian writers in which they do such homage to Jesus as would have been impossible a century or so ago.

A third result, which has not yet arrived, but which is, I believe, certain of arrival, is a worthier Christian apologetic. I can here only briefly indicate a few points which seem important. The theology which laid such emphasis on total human depravity is giving way to a theology which gives adequate emphasis to the truth that all men are made in the image of God and after His likeness. The theology which regarded certain intellectual

beliefs as essential to 'salvation' is giving way to a theology which regards the only 'salvation' worthy of the name as the 'deliverance' of the *whole* man from wrong thoughts, emotions, and actions. The theology which regarded sections of humanity as left to the 'uncovenanted mercies of God' is giving way to one which has as little room for so immoral a concept as present Christian thought has for the manifestation of the same dogma in rigorous Calvinism. The theology which was built upon an inerrant book gives place to a theology which regards the Bible as the finest, but not the only, product we have of the 'evolution' of man's knowledge of God, or of God's revelation of Himself to man—which is the same thing from another point of view. And, finally, the theology of the future will build Christ's thought of God into the very centre of the whole structure.

Second, *the historical and literary criticism of the Bible.* Every one now knows something of the findings of this most important branch of research in its application to the O.T., and few to-day find these results detrimental to their faith. Such questions as, Who wrote the Pentateuch? How many 'Isaiahs' were there? When was *Daniel* written, etc.? are now generally felt to deal with issues which have no destructive bearing upon our religion.

I say this is now the general attitude. It has not come in a day. Some reading this article, perhaps, have lived, and preached, through the transition period, when the difficulties for the preacher were greater than they are to-day. Let us younger men not forget those who by their fidelity to truth and unconcern for ecclesiastical preferment won for us the liberties we enjoy. Above all, let us not fail to do homage to the pioneers of this study, many of whom suffered intensely from the 'odium theologicum' in their day. Among the martyrs whose sufferings have been the seed of the Church are those who were martyred in spirit by the very Church itself of past days.

With regard to the O.T. it is perhaps sufficient to say that this study has for the majority of people served only to stimulate interest and to deepen appreciation of that in it which has abiding value.

To-day, however, the important issues raised for theology are not in the application of the 'critical' method to the O.T. The N.T. is now the absorbing field. We are here on more difficult ground, but it is important to note that the application of the critical method of approach to the N.T. can no longer be interdicted in the interests of a mechanical theory of its inspiration. This age feels itself as much at liberty to apply the canons of criticism to the N.T. as a former generation felt in applying them to the O.T.

What are the results of this application? It is not for me to attempt an exhaustive reply. It is beyond my capacity. Besides which, we are still *in mediis rebus.* A few words, however, may be permitted with regard to the Gospels. Here, without any manner of doubt, we are at the centre.

As regards the Fourth Gospel, it may be said that British scholars are on the whole more conservative in their estimate than continental scholars. Even so, there is fairly general agreement that this Gospel, whoever its author and whatever its date, has not the same historical value as the Synoptic Gospels. It will suffice here to give one recent judgment. Professor E. F. Scott writes: 'It may now be regarded as practically certain that the Fourth Gospel was written after the end of the first century, and that it presents the life of Jesus, not in a strictly historical fashion, but under the light of a given theology. It is not so much a record as an interpretation' (*The Ethical Teaching of Jesus,* p. 4).

As regards the Synoptic Gospels it is not for me here to enter upon a discussion of their 'sources,' merely commending to your critical interest the 'Proto-Luke hypothesis' suggested by Canon Streeter in his recent book, *The Four Gospels.*

The central problem for students of the Gospels is, without any manner of doubt, the Person of Jesus. The conclusions of historical investigation must have, it is obvious, a signal bearing upon the whole question of theological restatement.

No theology can be acceptable to our age which maintains positions rendered untenable by historical investigation. That will be generally agreed upon. The real question is as to whether there are any such positions.

This is matter for our corporate discussion. But I should like to make one or two suggestions. And, first, that the views of Drews, W. B. Smith, and J. M. Robertson are now generally discredited among competent and serious investigators. This may seem to be very slight gain, and to lead us not very far. At anyrate, it is something that the historicity of Jesus is accepted as a settled position among even the most 'advanced' historical investigators into the Gospels. Professor Maurice Goguel of Paris has recently written a book in which he sets forth the reasons why the Protestant Modernist rejects the Christ-myth theory of a few eccentric

critics.[1] My second suggestion is that behind Christianity and behind the Gospels there is a great and overwhelming personality of goodness, truth, and beauty. I know that these phrases may be used to hide difficulties. But I make this second assertion in order to set forth my own divergence from those who, while accepting the historicity of Jesus, seem to me to make Him a somewhat unimportant figure.

But, after all, the real problems remain. They centre round the 'miracles' of the Gospels. In regard to the 'virgin birth' the 'evidence' is of the slightest and few feel it necessary to maintain it. In regard to the Resurrection, discussion centres round its *mode*, the Modernist position being to cast doubts on the reanimation-of-the-physical-body mode. In other words, the suggestion is that the story of the empty tomb is unhistorical, likewise certain other 'materialistic details' which may be regarded as according with that story. Then there is the question of the 'miracles' reported as having been wrought by Jesus. In regard to these I would suggest that from the standpoint of theology it is unimportant as to which events happened and which did not happen precisely as reported. What matters is the 'explanation' accepted of the 'works.' Traditional apologetic has felt it necessary to maintain that these were to be understood only by Christ's utilization of omnipotence. A notion is there adumbrated which is morally shocking to most modern minds, which also it seems difficult, if not impossible, to harmonize with a Christian theory of Incarnation. With a certain amount of diffidence I give my own opinion here. A future theology of Christ's person will have as little room for this 'utilization-of-omnipotence' theory as a present theology has for the 'utilization-of-omniscience' theory of former days.

Third, *the investigations and principles of Natural Science.* In my own view the most vital questions arise at this point.

Every one rejoices in the change that has been wrought in the last two generations—with the exception, I suppose, of the 'fundamentalists.' The days have gone when religious people thought that to accept the findings of Science was to deny or betray the truths of Religion. In our prayers of Thanksgiving let us not forget this. It is not, however, true to say that Theology and Science are now 'reconciled.' There are fundamental issues still before us which call for pretty hard thinking.

I state the main problem this way. Science believes in a universe of Law and Order which can be traced. Religion believes in a God who acts in His universe. The reconciliation of these two 'faiths' constitutes, as I understand it, the crucial issue. It is the problem of MIRACLE—not, of course, the problem of 'Miracles.' It is the problem of IMMANENCE and TRANSCENDENCE. The Transcendence of orthodox apologetic is inacceptable to Science. The pantheistic tendency of scientific principles is inacceptable to theology. The problem of the place which Transcendence, and what kind of Transcendence, has to have in a Christian doctrine of God is one of the biggest questions confronting modern theology.

[1] Eng. tr., *Jesus the Nazarene—Myth or History?*

Literature.

THE SPIRIT OF WORSHIP.

FRIEDRICH HEILER has become known to readers in this country because of his leaving the Roman Church, and because of the wide influence he exerts at present in Germany. He has left the Church of his fathers, but has carried with him not a little of its best elements, and these are to be seen in the work just translated (excellently) by the Rev. W. Montgomery, M.A., B.D., in which he is introduced for the first time to the British public. *The Spirit of Worship, its Forms and Manifestations in the Christian Churches, with an Additional Essay on Catholicity, Eastern, Roman, and Evangelical,* is the elaborate title of the book (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). One can easily gather from this volume the reasons for Heiler's reputation. It is perfectly delightful to read. The charm of its style, the sheer interest of the facts in the narrative, the appealing spirit of the writer which breathes through all he says, make the book one of very unusual attractiveness. The contents may be briefly indicated. After pointing out the new interest in worship and the new longing for unity prevailing

all over the Christian world, Professor Heiler insists that all liturgies are drawn from the worship of the early Church, and that the one-sided character of each and all is due to the omission of one or other element to be found in that primitive worship. Then follows a careful and fascinating description of the different liturgies, Eastern, Roman, Lutheran, and Calvinistic. It is characteristic of Heiler that he dwells on the fact that each has its own truth and worth, and that the thing common to them all is the exaltation of the living Christ. The second part of the book is on Catholicity in its various forms, and here we have a vivid account of all the Christian bodies, Eastern, Roman, and Evangelical. Throughout this section the same delightful broad outlook is maintained. Heiler sees no Church without truth and beauty. He finds God everywhere and truth everywhere. And he strongly contends that in any union of Churches that may take place (and he is not keen about this at all) the special characteristics of each Church must be preserved. This book will create a strong desire for more of Heiler's work in English. It would not be too much to say that every reader of it is made at once a friend and admirer of the writer. He is in the best and truest sense of the word a Catholic whose Church is the Body of Christ.

THE HEBREW OLD TESTAMENT.

A truly monumental edition of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament has just been published in four volumes at 40s. a set by the British and Foreign Bible Society, under the supervision of the Rev. Dr. Kilgour, the editorial superintendent of the Society. The volumes contain respectively the Pentateuch, the Earlier Prophets, the Later Prophets, and the Writings—the last volume, which comprises so much of the poetry of the Old Testament printed as poetry (in which each 'limb' of a verse has a line to itself) being much the bulkiest of all, running to no fewer than nine hundred and ten pages.

The text is substantially that of the first edition of Jacob ben Chayim's Massoretic Recension, printed by Bomberg in Venice in 1524–25, and the present work represents the result of the labours of the late Dr. Ginsburg during his long life. He collated Ben Chayim's edition with over seventy Biblical MSS. and nineteen editions printed prior to that edition between 1482 and 1525. Each of these MSS. and early editions (most of which belong to the unique collection in the British Museum) has been carefully collated for variations in orthography, vowel points, accents, and sectional divisions, and very ample notes at the foot of the page, sometimes, indeed, occupying more than half the page, embody the principal results of this collation, and record in detail the source of each variation. Since Dr. Ginsburg's death in 1914, Professor A. S. Geden and the late Rev. H. E. Holmes, who died on October 30th, 1925, after concluding his labours, completed the work on Dr. Ginsburg's own lines. In addition, Professor E. Nestle, Professor I. I. Kahan, and Dr. W. Aldis Wright, who all predeceased Dr. Ginsburg, rendered valuable service in proof-reading, so that the text is as accurate as the most finical scholarship and the most conscientious care could make it.

The edition is one of the memorials—and none could be more impressive—of the Centenary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and each volume may be procured separately. Full information is given in each of the volumes as to the dates (sometimes approximate) of each of the MSS. collated, the MSS. being indicated by numbers in Hebrew lettering. The Ancient Versions are referred to only when they agree with a reading of the MSS. or with a probable emendation. It will thus be seen that this work, stupendous as it is, is very far from presenting all the evidence that has to be considered and weighed before any final edition of the Old Testament text can be constructed, if indeed that will ever be possible: work such as Nestle has done on the text of Jeremiah in his posthumously published edition of that prophet will have to be done on every book of the Old Testament. Critical editions of all the Ancient Versions will have to be executed on the same scale and with the same thoroughness, before all the available evidence can be said to be approximately gathered in; but never before has the purely Hebrew evidence been so thoroughly collated.

Roughly the proportion of text to footnotes containing the textual evidence is similar to that of Kittel's edition of the Hebrew text: difficult books like Job and Ezekiel have a much larger proportion of notes than the Pentateuch, where the text is simpler in itself and has been better preserved. But even so the evidence presented is astonishingly ample; for example, in so simple and straightforward a poem as Ps 1 the textual notes occupy nearly a page. A word must be said about the extraordinary beauty of the printing which is a delight to the eye, the notes scarcely less than the text itself. These charming volumes are the product at once of exquisite scholarship and of an incredible industry and care, and they

deserve the grateful attention of all who love the Old Testament and are interested in recovering its original text.

THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT GREECE.

In *The Religion of Ancient Greece* (Milford; 7s. 6d. net), Mr. Thaddeus Zieliński has a fascinating subject, and he throws himself into it with an abandon of enthusiasm. The postulates he lays down at the start at once awaken expectation and give confidence. 'What would be our own faith, if with our own souls and their needs we were living in those times?' he asks. And again, 'As a man bereft of artistic feeling cannot understand Greek art, so one who lacks religious feeling cannot understand Greek Religion.' That is the right spirit.

Moreover, the chapter headings are unusually appetizing, and the treatment is always full of interest. Hardly a page but grips and sets one thinking.

And yet a certain vague uneasiness will keep pushing in. It is seemly enough that this religion should be stated at its highest, but not quite honest so light-heartedly to ignore the very obvious shadows. When legitimate questions rise up in our mind, the author will have none of them. They were Greeks, he cries, and so of course knew all about it in a way you cannot do; and what looks crude to you is really to a spiritual nature wonderfully beautiful. For a while one accepts this with meekness of spirit. But at length the mind revolts. As Aristotle said, 'Between the friends Plato and the Truth, one must choose the Truth.' The fact is, that to the author everything Greek is dear and lovely, and everything not Greek very shabby in comparison. Even Christ was a product of Hellenized Galilee, and not of that other sorry faith with which men foolishly associate Him! The love of God was taught us not by Jews but Greeks. A Muhammadan, a Jew, most Christians, certainly, it seems, all Protestants, are dull souls living in a dim twilight compared with what Greece knew. If the author had a less parochial mind, if he had thought himself into the places of others besides Greeks, if he knew the Old Testament a tenth as well as he knows Greek Literature, he would have saved himself from certain wayward sayings and impossible judgments. But the fact is, he does not meet his own requirement. Without religious feeling, so his axiom ran; and, much as it will surprise him to be told it, the higher reaches of religion and religious feeling seem unknown to him.

Still this is an interesting book, a charming picture of the beauty of the Greek mind. And when one travels through the ugliness of our industrial areas, which the Greeks would not have tolerated for one day; and hears the squabbling of economic bickerings, whereas to them work was a glory, and a lovely thing; or looks round our empty churches, and recalls their horror of being shut out from their ordinances, who does not cry, Would the Greek spirit could arise again!

THE CAMBRIDGE PLATONISTS.

A very attractive book has been written on the famous men of the seventeenth century who revived the tradition of Plato and left behind them a great influence, *The Cambridge Platonists: A Study*, by Frederick J. Powicke, M.A., Ph.D. (Dent; 7s. 6d. net). Some of them are merely names to many to-day, Cudworth, and Whichcote, and Henry More. Others are not even names, Culverwel, John Smith, and Peter Sterry. But they are worthy of attention, in themselves first of all, because they were men of a sweet reasonableness, of lofty personal character, and with a rare devotion to truth; and, further, because they embodied a movement of thought and religion that had a far-reaching result in after times. 'We may say,' writes Dr. Powicke, 'that some of the most salient developments of the eighteenth century — Rationalism, Deism, Scripturalism, Moralism, Tolerance—went the way and took the form they did, because directed, more or less, by the principles or spirit of the Cambridge men.' The movement began in a Puritan and Calvinistic college, perhaps by reaction against its doctrine and practice, perhaps because Emmanuel was noted for intellect. It was essentially Christian in its dependence on the Bible and on Christ, as well as in its ethical emphasis. But it was opposed to the severer interpretation of Christian doctrine, such as predestination. It was characterized by tolerance and by indifference to secondary things like Church Government. To the Cambridge men the essentials of religion were few and simple, and the life it produced was the supreme concern. These things are very attractive, and with a commentator as sympathetic and competent as Dr. Powicke it is a joy to read about such men and absorb (let us hope) something of the fine spirit that breathes through these pages. The book contains not only a general description of the school, but a detailed account of each of the principal personalities. This is a fine 'study' of a pleasant subject.

PSYCHOLOGY AND CHRISTIANITY.

There is as yet no pause in the current of literature dealing with the relations of modern (or 'new') psychology and religion. The most obvious criticism to be made of this literature generally is the too great facility with which the conclusions of the New Psychology are accepted. It is true that valuable contributions have been made to our knowledge of the human mind, and that facts which orthodox psychology has ignored have been brought to light by the newer science. But many of the assertions of this science are more than doubtful, and more particularly their interpretations of facts which have been more or less familiar are to be viewed with extreme caution. Still, nothing but good can come from the examination and re-examination of their contentions, and we are grateful especially for books which subject their primary assumptions to scrutiny. A book of this kind has been written by Dr. Cyril H. Valentine, and introduced with warm commendation by Principal Garvie: *Modern Psychology and the Validity of Christian Experience* (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net). It is a very thorough piece of work, and, though the reasoning is close-knit, the argument is not beyond the powers of ordinary intelligence. There are four divisions in the book. The first lays a philosophical foundation. The second and third deal in detail with Christian doctrine and Christian practice in the light of psychological theory, and the fourth is purely theological, providing a philosophical justification for the doctrine and practice examined. The main thesis of the book may be said to be this, that the key to reality is to be found in personality. The highest personality is therefore the truest guide to the nature of reality, since the knowledge of reality is always morally conditioned. And as the highest personality is that of Christ, He is the truest revelation of God and of truth. But modern psychology may well give us a better understanding of that knowledge of ultimate things which is disclosed in Christ. And so we go on to the discussion of the various Christian doctrines. These are examined in view of psychological theories of the unconscious, of complexes and repressions, of transference and of the supraliminal. The various expressions of Christian experience are then looked at in turn—worship, prayer, faith, forgiveness, and so on. The concluding chapters, on the authority of Christ, the personality of God, the Creation and the Incarnation, are in some ways the best part of the book. The pages on the doctrine of the Trinity in particular are extraordinarily good, and it may be easily seen that the writer has thoroughly enjoyed himself in this section. It may also be said, generally, of his argument, that few more careful or able investigations of the subject have been made in recent times; and the book will repay careful and patient reading.

A lighter treatment of the same theme is offered in *The New Psychology and the Gospel*, by Mr. W. J. Wray, M.A., Lecturer on Psychology at the Associated Colleges, Selly Oak (R.T.S.; 6s. net). This book is written in a definitely religious interest, and each chapter has an appropriate (and sometimes singularly beautiful) prayer attached to it. The main idea of the book is that the gospel has far more to give man than psychology, and has a far truer judgment of his nature and possibilities. Christ recognized and used all the forces that the New Psychology discloses. The main defects of this new science are, the writer thinks, its low view of man, its large and entirely baseless promises, its false emphasis on instinct, and its blindness to the real power of religion. An added (and perhaps supreme) defect is that it fails to give their true place to the intellect and the will in human life. Each of the characteristic doctrines of the new psychology is taken in turn, and we are both warned of their defective value and pointed to Christ for a fulfilment of what is true in them. The treatment is popular and slight, but the author knows his subject, and for many minds who wish to know what it is all about this book will provide just the easy knowledge they seek. The deeply religious spirit of the writer must be gratefully acknowledged, and his skilful use of the new theory in the interest of a loyal Christian faith.

FRANK, BISHOP OF ZANZIBAR.

When the Bishop of Hereford appointed Dr. Streeter to a vacant stall in the Cathedral a notice appeared on the door of the Cathedral Church in far-away Zanzibar. It was placed there by Dr. Weston, Bishop of Zanzibar, and was to the effect that 'he and this diocese were no longer in communion with John, Bishop of Hereford, and those who adhered to him.' This incident is recorded in the life of *Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar, 1871–1924*, which has just been published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (7s. 6d. net). The biographer is Dr. H. Maynard Smith, and he is thoroughly sympathetic with Dr. Weston's main positions, although sometimes critical of the precise manner in which he maintained them. The

Bishop of Zanzibar was a great fighter. There was not only his fight with Modernism, but the more famous one with the evangelical bishops of Uganda and Mombasa when he denounced them for the part they had taken at Kikuyu and charged them with propagating heresy and committing schism. There was nothing out of character here. One of his fellow-students at Trinity College —a Presbyterian—writes of a visit which he paid to his home during a vacation. 'I remember him lying on the hearthrug in my father's billiard room with a glass of hot rum in his hand (he usually drank beer) and closing a long argument on ecclesiastical matters by calling his host (a True Blue Presbyterian and son of the Manse) an "infantile Christian." This was characteristic of his attitude to Nonconformity in those days. He regarded it with just a little wonder as a kind of half-baked religion. This might have been very irritating, but it never was.'

But the one fact which emerges most clearly from this biography is Dr. Weston's many-sidedness. 'No label,' the biographer says, 'is large enough to summarize Frank.' Intellectually he was very brilliant; he was thoroughly progressive in his missionary methods, and was entirely without consciousness of race superiority. He set himself to be not an alien ruler, 'but a real father to his black children.' He was supremely efficient in whatever he undertook, and a born disciplinarian, and during the War he raised and led a Carrier Corps in German East Africa. Though he disciplined, he protected his men, and he was quick to adjust burdens and save the weak. A year after the Corps was disbanded General Smuts wrote to him: 'May I thank you for your great services at the head of your Carrier Corps in G.E.A. The Archbishop of Canterbury was much interested in my picture of you marching with an enormous crucifix at the head of your black column. I told him that, from my point of view, it was better service than Kikuyu controversies.'

This is an admirable biography, from every page of which there stands out the figure of Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar, militant it may be, yet a saint who had seen a vision of beauty and yearned for others to see it too.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE METHODIST REVIVAL.

Twenty-five years ago William James in his 'Varieties of Religious Experience' brilliantly discoursed on the importance for psychology of recognizing religious experience as a real human experience; and in a volume entitled *The Psychology of the Methodist Revival* (Milford; 10s. 6d. net), Mr. Sydney G. Dimond, M.A., worthily follows in his steps. He takes the religious experience of John Wesley and his early followers as his field and applies to this the modern prevailing psychological theories—Behaviourism, the various psychoanalytic views associated with Vienna and Zürich, and the theories of Macdougall and Shand.

The choice of subject-matter and the treatment reflect credit on the judiciousness and scholarship of the author, reveal that he has bestowed original research on the records of early Wesleyanism and that he is thoroughly abreast of modern psychological investigation. So impartial is his survey that one can say with equal truth that he seems on the one hand to evaluate recent psychological theories by bringing them to the test of this phase of experience, and on the other hand that he examines the validity of this religious experience itself in the light of current theories of psychology. By his choice of subject he is able to discuss religious experience *in situ*—showing how it is related to the historical milieu—and thus avoids a defect that marred to some extent James' method, which took no thought of the historical situation. The reader will find much light thrown on Wesley's century with its new problems and changing social outlook—a real help to the spiritual understanding of the great work of Wesley. The writer manifests a sympathetic attitude towards Wesley's religious experience, and his treatment is characterized by frankness and a disinterested ambition to arrive at truth. His picture leaves on the mind a sense of the permanent worth and lasting influence towards the enrichment of human life of John Wesley's personality.

The scientific modesty of psychological procedure debars the writer from raising the question save by hints—What produced this wonderful experience? Was it the need of his age, something in his environment? Shall we say with Southey, that the age was ripe for him and that if he had not risen then some one else would, or was Wesley correct in saying it was the Spirit of God? Is it unpsychological to face this issue, which, after all, is the problem which interests us in John Wesley? If this is not true he was suffering from a painful delusion. Books such as the present seem to indicate that psychology is being slowly brought face to face with this question—and if in its pursuit it at times appears to get into strange depths with the psychoanalysts—or to desert its higher functions by

endeavours to explain the human mind by circumstances or by the behaviour of the lower animals, we are hopeful that it will verify for itself in the end the truth of Augustine's saying that if we dig deep enough into the human we ultimately touch the divine.

The volume is worthy of the workmanship of the Oxford University Press and will be welcomed by all students both of psychology and religion.

The Inner Discipline, by Mr. Charles Baudouin and Mr. A. Lestchinsky, first published in 1924, has now been issued by Messrs. Allen & Unwin as one of their 'New Psychology Handbooks' (3s. 6d. net). There are chapters on Buddhism, Stoicism, Christianity, and various forms of mind-cure, the object of the book being to show that there is a common psycho-therapeutic thread running through them all.

Professor de Faye, of the Protestant Faculty of Theology in Paris, is engaged on a study of Origen. He was invited to deliver a course of lectures on Origen in the University of Upsala; those were published, and have been translated by Mr. Fred Rothwell—*Origen and his Work*, by Eugène de Faye (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). The small but valuable volume will whet the desire of all scholars to see the fuller work. It deals with Origen's mode of thought and the influences which coloured and determined his views. It then sets out what he taught on such topics as God, Cosmology, Christology, Redemption, and the Last Things. There follows a concluding chapter of special excellence and value in which we learn the causes of the suspicion and even hatred with which the views of Origen came to be regarded in the Church, and how 'this great character, this great Christian and noble thinker,' was 'stamped as a heretic.' Origen was a pure Greek, and that age did not understand Greek thought, and so did not understand Origen. In truth, it is not easy to understand him. Dr. de Faye, however, may be trusted as a sympathetic exponent who at least helps us to come nearer it.

Two books published by Mr. H. R. Allenson deserve special attention. They are *Winning from Scratch:* Thirty-three Story Talks to Young People, by the Rev. J. Cocker (3s. 6d. net), and *Stories of Grit:* Thrilling Tales of Boys who made Good, by Mr. Archer Wallace (2s. 6d. net). Perhaps Mr. Cocker has an advantage in being a New Zealander—he is a Methodist minister there. However that may be, these children's sermons of his are very fresh and full of imagination. They do not lend themselves easily to quotation, but here is how he drives home to the young people the results of drinking intoxicating liquor. 'After a person has drunk a few glasses of spirits or beer the heart says, "Something has made me feel tired, and I can scarcely keep on pumping." "Dear me," the brain replies, "some nasty fumes have muddled me. I can't think or reason clearly. Something has made me lose control of things. I'm sure I can't instruct the hands how to steer a motor car." "Well, really," exclaims the memory, "my film has become blurred, and I can't clearly remember things." "We sympathise with you," reply the ears, "for we have become dull of hearing, and we can't understand what people are saying." "We are in a fix," confided the eyes to the tongue. "We seem to see double. If we were taking part in a cricket match we should see two balls, and would not know which one to catch. As we look at the moon we can see two." "S'cuse my speech," replied the tongue, "but I can't put my words in for-rum." "Oh, dear," exclaim the nerves, "something has inflamed and excited us, and we can't flash messages to the brain as usual." "Dear me," replied the liver, with a sigh, "I am so hot and thirsty; I would like a drink of soda water." Said the hands to the legs, "We are trembling, and we have lost the grip of things." "We can assure you," replied the legs, "that we are in a desperate state; we feel weak and shaky, and when we try to walk we can only zigzag. We really can't walk home. We shall have to lie down and rest." Down falls the wonderful body.'

There is an introduction to *Stories of Grit* by Mr. Taylor Statten, Secretary of the National Boys' Work Board in Canada. He says they should be read by all ambitious boys and also by all in whom the fires of ambition have not yet been kindled, for no boy can read them 'without believing more firmly in his ability to succeed.' We can endorse this, and would suggest that this account of George Matheson, the blind boy who became a poet; Josiah Wedgewood, the lame boy who became the world's greatest potter; John Kitto, the deaf boy who became a great Bible scholar; and all the other heroes whose stories follow, would make an excellent gift book for either boys or girls.

The Hundred and Twenty-second Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society has just been issued

(The Bible House, Queen Victoria Street, London). Surely it has the honour of being the cheapest book published. It contains three hundred and eight octavo pages, besides numerous appendixes, and the price is one shilling. It gives very fully the work of the Society during the year. There is much to rejoice over. Seven new versions have been made, four of these being for African peoples. In spite of set-backs in some countries—the Society is still prevented from resuming work in Russia—the sales of the Scriptures have been very encouraging, while in England there has been a substantial increase.

A popular account of the Society's work is published at the same time. The title is *The Everlasting Doors.*

The treatise of Sallustius on the Gods and the Universe is of great interest and importance. It was probably written by a friend of Julian the Apostate, shortly before the death of that ill-starred reviver of philosophical paganism. It reveals how far the Pagan theology had been modified, and how it attempted to obviate the common criticisms made by Christians. It is, we may say, the last word of Paganism at its best. The treatise disappeared almost from knowledge until comparatively quite recent times; and we have now for the first time an adequate edition of it—*Sallustius: Concerning the Gods and the Universe,* edited with Prolegomena and Translation by Mr. A. D. Nock (Cambridge University Press; 12s. 6d. net). The prolegomena are very valuable, and the editing of the Text, the translation, and the notes are on a very high level of scholarship.

Those who are ignorant—and they are many—of the Jewish background of the New Testament will find their wants simply and agreeably supplied by the Rev. Khodadad E. Keith, M.A., in a little volume entitled *The Social Life of a Jew in the Time of Christ* (Church Missions to Jews, 16 Lincoln's Inn Fields, London; 2s. net). In a brief but thoroughly interesting study, illustrated by three pictures and by many quotations from the Rabbis, the writer follows the career of a Jew from the cradle to the grave, dealing in successive chapters with birth, circumcision, name, ceremonies on reaching maturity, games and sports, schools and colleges, writing, marriage, death and burial. The discussion throws fresh light on many a New Testament text, and the Jewish life contemporary with our Lord becomes a very living thing indeed.

The Rev. T. H. Walker, minister of the Congregational Church in Uddingston, has written his autobiography. Probably he would not admit that it was an autobiography. He modestly calls it 'Pages from a Parson's Notebook,' with the title of *Echoes and Memories* (David J. Clark Ltd., 34–38 Cadogan Street, Glasgow; 5s. net). In his early days he was minister of a church in Dalkeith, and he gives an interesting account of Annie S. Swan and her family, who were members of his church. A later chapter is occupied by reminiscences of Rainy, Whyte, Parker, Spurgeon, and other prominent men of the churches with whom he came into contact.

The Humanism of Jesus, by the Rev. R. H. W. Shepherd, M.A. (James Clarke; 5s. net), is defined as 'a study in Christ's human sympathies.' It contains a number of chapters on such topics as Jesus and His Family Circle, Jesus and the Poor, the Children, the World of Nature, etc. They are finely done, with real insight and imagination. The writer is a missionary in South Africa, and besides giving evidence of surprisingly wide reading he draws some apposite illustrations from native life. It is altogether a winsome picture which he paints of Jesus in His sympathy with and participation in the common lot of man.

Next year will witness the centenary of the pretended discovery of the golden leaves of the Book of Mormon. In view of this Dr. J. H. Snowden, the editor of 'The Presbyterian Banner,' has published *The Truth about Mormonism* (Doran; $2.50). The strange and dramatic story of the Mormons is here told with all fairness and charity. It is an amazing record of fraud and crime, of heroism and endurance, of gross superstition and immorality. Fortunately things have greatly improved in recent years. The law against polygamy is being fairly well observed, and the younger generation is showing a strong tendency to depart from the peculiar doctrines and practices of their creed. The menace of Mormonism is largely abated, evangelical religion is holding its own in Salt Lake City, and there is some hope that the Mormons 'might become in time a recognized form of Christianity and take their place in the circle of the Christian brotherhood.'

On that theme of never-ending controversy, *Revelation and Inspiration in the Bible,* the Rev. R. K. Lyle, M.A., has written with much persuasiveness (Eason & Son, Dublin; 1s. net). The key to

the problem which oppresses so many people lies, he argues, in regarding the Bible as exhibiting 'the progressive grasp of a continuous revelation.' But while that revelation culminates in the perfect Christ, by whose spirit, for Christians, the whole revelation must be tested, the very idea of progression implies imperfection in the earlier stages; and imperfection in revelation can be no more surprising than that our redemption should have been purchased by One who had lived as a carpenter and died on a cross. God's methods are to be determined by what happened, not by what we think ought to have happened. Mr. Lyle is conscious that his appeal is upon an elementary level, but for that very reason there are multitudes of perplexed people whom it is very well fitted to help.

Under the somewhat vague title, *The Appreciation of Literature*, Mr. E. E. Kellett, M.A., has written a comprehensive little volume of one hundred and fifty pages, priced far below its real value at half a crown (Epworth Press). It is not meant to prepare students for examinations, though it has its value even for them, but 'to assist those whose main occupation lies outside the field of literature, but who are wishful to share in the delight which literature, perhaps to a higher degree than any other form of art, is capable of affording.' He seeks to enlist them into the battalion of readers of good literature by telling them it is amazing what they can gain thereby in half an hour a day, in the way of education and the purest delight. 'I have known many keen business men who have thus studied, and I have never known a bankrupt among them, nor one who has regretted the study-hours as wasted.' Mr. Kellett tells readers how they may study the best in poetry, history, essays, novels, and the Bible as literature. How strange in these days of higher education to find how difficult it is to persuade even professing Christians to make a habit of reading the Bible as was common in more illiterate days. 'It can be read through in a year at five minutes a day,' but people who have been at church in the forenoon spend the afternoon with that terrible abomination the Sunday newspaper. 'I am not speaking,' says Mr. Kellett, 'of the moral and spiritual gains of such a reading [of the Scriptures of the Old Testament and the New Testament], but merely of the results of the kind of study which we give to Shakespeare or to Hardy.' Mr. Kellett does not, like Lord Avebury, give a list of the best hundred books, nevertheless his selection of the best for those to whom he appeals is as admirable as the general tenor of his advice.

The story of the Jews during the last five centuries before Christ has been briefly but ably told by the Rev. Laurence E. Browne, B.D., in a little volume with the striking title *From Babylon to Bethlehem* (Heffer; 3s. 6d. net). Mr. Browne's previous volume on 'Early Judaism' revealed much independent study of the earlier part of this period, and his new volume presupposes the conclusions reached in the earlier one: *e.g.* Is 63^{6}–64 is attributed to a Samaritan prophet, the work of Trito-Isaiah is to be found in Is 49^{14}–50^{3} and 58–63^{6}, and Ezra—of the strength of whose faith Mr. Browne has no very high opinion—is later than Nehemiah. There are in the book many happy characterizations of men and periods; *e.g.* 'for Second Isaiah, politics were to be consecrated to God; for Third Isaiah, God's favour was to be used for the furtherance of Israel's political aims.' Good use is made of the Elephantine papyri in the sketch of the period 'round about 400 B.C.' The volume, which deals among other things with the triumph of the Law, the invasion of Greek thought, and the Pharisees and Sadducees, forms an admirable introduction to the too little known period between the historical books of the Old Testament and the New.

At the presentation of its proposals for the New Lectionary in 1917, the Convocation of Canterbury recommended that the Reader of the Lessons should introduce them with a brief word of explanation. In response to this recommendation, a number of such explanations appeared in 'The Guardian' in 1923 and 1924, and these, along with others, have been published in a volume entitled *The Message of the Lessons;* Short Introductions to the Lessons for Sundays and Holy Days in the Revised Lectionary, by the Rev. J. Anthony Wood, M.A. (Heffer; 4s. 6d. net). Each 'explanation' consists of about a dozen lines, and they are admirably clear and sufficient for the purpose. They will be very useful to ministers of all the Churches. And, indeed, the suggested custom of prefacing the lessons in divine service by a brief introduction is so excellent that a book like this should have a wide usefulness were it only in suggesting the idea.

We welcome a volume of sermons with the felicitous title *Days of the Son of Man* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net), by the Rev. W. Mackintosh Mackay, D.D. We welcome it not only for its intrinsic qualities—there is a rare evangelical

flavour in these sermons and the thought is expressed in a delightfully direct way, accompanied by many forcible illustrations—but because it is a volume of sermons for special occasions. For there are many volumes of sermons published, but few of them are for special occasions. Here we find sermons for most of the great days of the Church calendar. We have chosen one of the sermons for 'The Christian Year' this month.

The Children's Life of Jesus, in the Bible's Own Words, by Mr. Arthur Mee (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net), is a beautiful book, a choice treasure for children. After the manner of Professor Moffatt's similar book for adults, each section is prefaced by a page of introduction done in simple language. The sections of the narratives are headed appropriately and the text is printed in clear dark type. In addition there are many beautiful pictures, reproductions of famous paintings. The best recommendation of the book is that a copy of it has been used and prized by a child of eleven years of age and is constantly in her hands.

We cannot help being interested in a man who comes to a city like Glasgow,—his own native city, by the way,—finds a down-town church almost empty, and within a comparatively short time, and without the use of any sensational methods, fills it. This has been done by the Rev. William Erskine Blackburn, M.A., of Renfield Street United Free Church, Glasgow. It is good that Mr. Gardner of Largs has persuaded him to publish a volume of his sermons. The title is *Invincible Love* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). Here is one of Mr. Blackburn's illustrations. 'In a South of England holiday resort a visitor with his four-year-old boy was walking toward the beach. Outside a house on a side-street the child suddenly stood still and exclaimed, "Daddy, see! A wooden man making a windmill go ever so fast!" But the father replied, "Nay, sonny, it is not the man who is making the windmill go. It is the windmill that is making the man go." "No, no, the man is bending up and down, and his hands are going ever so fast," said the child eagerly. And the father explained that the hands of the man were attached to the windmill, through which the power of the wind was transmitted to otherwise lifeless limbs. Jesus had done great things for His followers during three years of earthly fellowship. They could not measure their loss when cruel hands nailed Him to the Cross. Their very life seemed to ooze away. Their faith almost died. But into their listlessness He came. And the listless men were energized. They were indeed re-created. Soon it became necessary for critics to find an explanation of the mysterious power that manifested itself in them. They found it in this, "They had been with Jesus."'

We cannot have too many forms of worship, at least for churches where prayer is 'free,' and where consequently the whole riches of liturgical worship can be used. A welcome will therefore be offered to *Common Prayer in Nine Services* edited by the Rev. J. M. Connell (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). These services are intended to meet the requirements of 'Liberal Christian Worship,' which, we suppose, means Unitarian worship. But they contain not only many of the fine liturgical passages of Scripture, but also many of the great and traditional prayers from the historical liturgies. We miss the general confession of the Book of Common Prayer, which certainly ought to be included. But for the book as a whole we have nothing but cordial appreciation.

Snowden's Sunday School Lessons are so well known that it will only be necessary to chronicle the appearance of the volume for 1927 to ensure a welcome for it. The International Sunday School Lessons are the basis of the exposition, and these are explained clearly and helpfully so that both teacher and preacher will benefit (Macmillan).

The King's Cross, by the Rev. Angus Dun (Longmans; 3s. net), consists of a series of meditations on the Seven Words from the Cross, printed as they were delivered at Lenten services. They are at once thoughtful and devotional, with a welcome note of healthy-mindedness. 'It may seem strange to speak of Lent as a time for restoring our good nature and our love of life.' But 'the road to a *good nature* leads through the repentance of Ash Wednesday. And the road to an abiding love of life leads through the sorrow of Good Friday.'

A short account of *Mussolini: His Work and the New Syndical Law*, has been written by Cavaliere Raffaele Muriello, a Lieutenant-Colonel in the Italian Army. It is published in this country by Messrs. MacNiven & Wallace, Edinburgh. It is of particular interest to us because it contains a foreword by Professor Stalker. 'As for the subject itself,' he says, 'I do not pretend to have opinions

of special value, though for two seasons I have been in Italy, where Mussolini is a daily and hourly topic of conversation; but none acquainted with the position of Capital and Labour in the world in general, and especially in our own country, at the present time, can fail to be interested in a man who even seems to have solved the social problem for a great country like Italy, without strikes and without nationalisation.' We would suggest that this apologia of Fascism be read and that the statistics which Colonel Muriello gives be attentively studied. They are certainly impressive.

Under the title *A Travelling Scholar*, the Rev. T. Crouther Gordon, D.F.C., B.D., has re-published a series of essays relating chiefly to exploration work in Palestine (Methuen; 6s. net), the last and, in our opinion, the best of which, entitled 'Theology and Archæology,' appeared in The Expository Times for June last. Having been awarded the Kerr Travelling Scholarship and having been nominated by Glasgow University to a Scholarship in the British School of Archæology in Jerusalem, he was an eye-witness of the exploration work which he describes in these impressionist sketches.

The Preacher said 'of making many books there is no end,' and his words in our time seem specially applicable to books on preaching. Another volume on the subject has appeared, this time from the pen of the Rev. Samuel McComb, D.D., its title being *Preaching in Theory and Practice* (Milford; 7s. 6d. net). It is packed full of excellent advice on the preparation and delivery of sermons, with abundant illustrations drawn from the works of distinguished preachers and speakers. The discussion moves on a high level, and, if preaching is to be discussed as a fine art, nothing perhaps could be better. Yet one feels that the highest reaches are untouched and that there is something mechanical, not to say artificial, in the treatment. At the close of the book three sermons are minutely analysed, a method of study which seems to find favour in America.

To 'The World's Manuals' Series Mr. H. A. R. Gibb, M.A., has contributed the volume on *Arabic Literature* (Milford; 2s. 6d. net). Within the short compass of one hundred and twenty-eight pages no more than a brief introduction to this enormous field was possible, and the best tribute we can pay to the skill with which Mr. Gibb has presented his summaries of Arabic writers and their books is to confess that he has whetted our appetite for more. After a brief discussion of the Arabic language, he deals successively with the Heroic Age (500–622), the Age of Expansion (622–750), the Golden Age (750–1055), the Silver Age (1055–1258), and the Age of the Mamlūks (1258–1800), while the Epilogue is reserved for a brief discussion of the neo-Arabic literature of the last century. The book fills a real gap, for, with the exception of the Koran and the Arabian Nights, Arabic literature, despite its famous names such as Abū Nuwās, aṭ-Ṭabarī, al-Ghazāli, and the encyclopædic range of its interests, is a *terra incognita* to most people. The narrative is illumined by a few snatches (in translation) of Arabic prose, and some fine renderings of Arabic poetry by Palmer and Professor Nicholson.

In the end of 1921 Bishop Gore's 'Belief in God' appeared. This was followed in 1922 by 'Belief in Christ,' and in 1924 the trilogy was completed with 'The Holy Spirit and the Church.' The three volumes have now been published in one with the title *The Reconstruction of Belief*. As the separate volumes received long notices it will not be necessary to review the present one at length. But its amazing cheapness must be pointed out. It is attractively bound in green with gilt lettering; the type is clear; there are over one thousand pages, and the price is only 7s. 6d. net. How can Mr. John Murray do it?

An excellent small Bibliography has been prepared by the Committee of the Society for Old Testament Study. It is primarily intended for the use of teachers in Secondary Schools and Bible Students. The Bibliography arranges the books under the following divisions: Translations and Texts; Literature and Criticism; Geography and Archæology; History of Israel; Religion of Israel; Commentaries; The Study of the Languages. All these deal with the Old Testament and occupy more than half the space, but lists of books on the New Testament are also given. Under each of the headings the books suitable for teachers and students appear first, and then afterwards those for class use. Useful notes on the contents of the books are also given—most of these contributed by Professor Peake. The Committee was anxious to publish the Bibliography cheaply, and so they have been obliged to restrict the size somewhat, but the lists are extremely well chosen and the information thoroughly reliable. The title is *A Scripture Bibliography*, and the price only 6d. (Nisbet.)

Some time ago we reviewed a short and popular account of the 1925 Stockholm Conference. The Oxford University Press has now issued the full official report of this Conference, a report which has been edited in a most thorough way by the Dean of Canterbury. *The Stockholm Conference, 1925*, is the title, and the price is 12s. 6d. net, which is moderate considering the vast amount of valuable matter contained. The Conference was attended by 'over 500 representatives of the greater number of Christian Communions coming from thirty-seven different nations.' The original invitation was to all Christian Communions, but the Roman Catholic Church held itself aloof. In this volume, then, there will be found an authoritative record of the mind of leading men in all the Protestant Churches on the application of Christian principles to social and industrial life. It should be regarded as an indispensable addition to the industrial and sociological library.

In *Paul Kanamori's Life-Story*, written by himself (Pickering & Inglis; 2s. 6d. net), we have a remarkable autobiography of a native of Japan who became not only a Christian convert but a Christian missionary. He has been called 'the Moody of Japan,' for he stirred American audiences with what he calls his 'one sermon' as Moody stirred the people of this country. The story, which fills a small volume of a hundred pages, was written for American readers and is published here as it was written.

It is a little more than forty years since the Universities and the Churches in this country were stirred by the good tidings of the going forth into the mission field in China of 'The Cambridge Seven'—seven graduates of Cambridge University at the head of whom was Mr. C. T. Studd, one of the most notable English cricketers of his day. This was among the fruits of Mr. Moody's memorable evangelistic tours in this country. No such missionary meeting had occurred before as that held in the old Exeter Hall in London to take leave of these young men on the night before they embarked for China in February, 1885. One of the seven, and the only one in Holy Orders, was the Rev. W. W. Cassels, then a young curate in a South London parish, who afterwards became the first bishop in Western China, in the populous province of Szechwan. He is described by the Archbishop of Canterbury as 'one of the very foremost missionaries of our time.' The story of his career has been admirably written by Mr. Marshall Broomhall, M.A., the experienced secretary of the China Inland Mission—*W. W. Cassels, First Bishop in Western China* (R.T.S.; 6s. net). It is a narrative that will take its place among the fascinating biographies of great missionary pioneers. Though he had done nothing notable at Cambridge, yet Mr. Cassels' subsequent career was the most remarkable among his contemporaries. He was a man without fear, steadfast and tenacious, and to crown all, with a profound belief in the power of prayer. 'We must advance upon our knees,' was one of his sayings. He had to leave his post during the Boxer Rebellion, but returned at the earliest moment; and he held on during the recent anti-British menace, serious though this has proved, until an outbreak of fever carried off both his wife and himself within a few days. Mr. Broomhall has done a real service to the cause of missions in China in publishing such a story of self-sacrifice and devotion at this time of crisis.

The Spiritual Unfolding of Bishop H. C. G. Moule, by the Rev. John Baird (Oliphants; 3s. 6d. net), is not in any sense a biography, nor even a record of Bishop Moule's religious experiences. It is mainly an exposition of the Keswick teaching on sanctification, of which Bishop Moule was, of course, one of the most learned and distinguished exponents. The treatment is very sane and scriptural, and the thread of biography, slight though it is, gives an added interest to the book. It should find a warm welcome in evangelical circles, and especially among those to whom the name of Keswick is fragrant.

The Dean of Winchester has revised his scholarly and well-documented life of Becket. First published in 1910 by Messrs. Pitman & Sons, it is now issued by the Cambridge University Press with the title *Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury* (8s. 6d. net). With regard to the name we pass on Dr. W. H. Hutton's plea—'that all who read this book would set themselves to stamp out the use, for the family name of the archbishop, of the barbarism "à Becket": the "à" has no contemporary, or early, authority whatever, and is as ugly as it is useless.' Becket's conflicts with Henry II. and Henry III., his exile and subsequent reconciliation and return, his action in excommunicating a number of his opponents, so quickly followed by his martyrdom in Canterbury Cathedral in the Christmas week of 1170, are facts so well known that they hardly require statement. The standard of Dr. Hutton's biography is also too well established to

need proof. It would have been a great pity if it had remained inaccessible longer—it has been out of print for many years. Dr. Hutton has gone to the original sources, has examined the chief scenes of Becket's life and carefully weighed all the facts, and he leaves the reader with a good understanding of the reason why the Archbishop became in after years so popular a hero.

It is said that since the War the popularity of lectures is undiminished and that there is an increasing demand for talks on travel, especially those illustrated with good lantern slides. The fact is our delight in pictures is never lost, and 'eye gate' is as much the favourite entrance to the mind in adult life as in childhood. This being so, a new production, of which the Sheldon Press are the British publishers, entitled *Palestine and Transjordania,* by Ludwig Preiss and Paul Rohrbach (30s. net), should receive a welcome. It is a handsome quarto volume containing 235 plates, the majority full-page size. Twenty-one of these are in colour. The form of the book is really that of a travel lecture, in which the chief emphasis is placed upon the illustrations. There is a brief introduction of some five pages, after which come seven pages of descriptive matter in which the plates are referred to in numerical order. The remaining 200 pages consist of photographs, the technical quality of which leaves nothing to be desired.

Guidance and Rule, by the Rev. J. B. Lancelot, M.A. (Skeffington; 2s. 6d. net), contains twelve popular lectures on the Sermon on the Mount. In the preface the writer says modestly, 'I cannot pretend that there is much here that is original, but I trust that readers may be found who are glad to have the subject treated in short compass and in simple fashion.' Such readers will find here a rich repast of stimulating thought and sane Christian teaching.

A sensible, yet semi-mystical, little book with its own message is *Love and Marriage: In Earth and Heaven,* by Rev. T. H. Passmore, M.A. (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). As the sub-title hints, there is more in the book than meets the eye at once. Love is the theme, love in God and in man. But love is most real to us in marriage, and the writer's thoughts start from this and return to it, and take flight from it to higher values and higher themes. Still, however far he soars, he comes back to questions like 'the moral fallacy of divorce' and the question of birth control. There is much that is beautiful in these dozen or so chapters, much that is edifying, and not a little that is spiritual and uplifting.

A very useful little book, *Everyday Prayers,* has been prepared by a sub-committee of the Schools Department of the Student Christian Movement (2s. 6d. net). It is intended primarily for use in schools, clubs, and young people's societies. The prayers are very brief, sometimes a single sentence, and they are arranged under various headings. Evidently the intention is to provide the teacher, officer, or leader with a simple directory which may furnish suggestions for the morning and evening prayers in school and camp. The work is done with judgment and taste, and doubtless many will welcome the help thus given.

The story of the Jews since the Old Testament canon was closed is hardly less diversified and interesting than their story as recorded in the Old Testament itself, and it is a great convenience to have it told within the compass of two hundred and twenty-six pages by one who knows it thoroughly. This has been done by Professor Ismar Elbogen, Ph.D., in his *History of the Jews after the Fall of the Jewish State* (Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Cincinnati), the original German text of which has here been translated and expanded. The story is divided into four periods: (i) The Jews in Ancient Times (70–600 A.D.), (ii) in the Middle Ages (600–1500), (iii) after the Discovery of America (1500–1750), and (iv) in Modern Times (since 1750). In each period the principal phases of their experience are dealt with —the legislation which affected them, their economic status, their social position, their intellectual activity, their secular culture, their religious movements, their persecutions, and the book closes with a brief discussion of the Reform Movement, Anti-Semitism, and Zionism.

It is a sad story, which, in many of its phases, reflects little credit on the representatives of official Christianity, and one can only admire the heroic patience with which unjust sufferings were borne and the inextinguishable hope whose light brightened the darkness. The Jews were hated, as one of them pointedly remarked, 'not because they deserved it, but because they were successful.' It will be news to those who despise the Jews for their skill in driving a bargain to learn that the Jews were patronized as money-lenders 'because

the Christian money-lenders demanded much higher rates' (p. 145). Christians need further to be reminded that if in the Talmud there is much that is fantastic, there is also the ripe fruit of wide experience and profound wisdom. Even 'Kabbalah was a tower of strength during the centuries of oppression and sorrow,' though Elbogen admits that it was 'fatal to clear thinking.' We have here in clear, bold outlines 'the marvelous story of Jewish experience' simply and interestingly told.

Present-Day Faiths.

Congregationalism.

By Professor Nathaniel Micklem, M.A., Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham.

The various branches of the divided Church are distinguished not only by peculiarities of doctrine, but also by differences in their way of conducting business, in their ecclesiastical machinery, and in the *ethos*, difficult to define, which characterizes their denominational life and worship.

The distinctive doctrine of the Congregational Churches can be readily and briefly defined, but Congregationalism as an historical phenomenon shows, as is natural, only a partial manifestation of its central principle, and is marked by more or less derivatory characteristics which distinguish it from other denominations.

I.

The fundamental and distinctive Congregational doctrine is the independence or spiritual autonomy of the individual Church. The sheet-anchor of the Reformation is Luther's doctrine of the Liberty of the Christian man. Luther proclaimed open access to God through Christ without necessary mediation of Church, priesthood, or intercession of the saints. Every believer, in Luther's thought, possesses Christ for himself, has a personal and intimate relationship to Christ, and receives direct from Christ all necessary succour and guidance for life and death. This doctrine is accepted by all Protestant Churches in so far as they stand in the Protestant succession. But owing to some curious limitation of Protestant thought this doctrine of liberty has rarely been extended from the Christian individual to the Christian group. If the Christian individual is free to go direct to Christ for guidance and in the last resort is responsible to his Master alone, it would seem to follow inevitably that the Christian group, met for common action or worship in Christ's name and in His presence, has likewise direct access to Christ and is responsible in the last resort to Him alone. This does not involve that the Christian individual or group is absolved from loyalty and obligation to the Church as a whole, but that neither the Church as a whole nor any official or section of it may override the conscience of the group or interfere authoritatively between the group and its sense of Divine guidance. The Congregational principle is not inconsistent, therefore, with connexional or denominational life or with the unity of the whole Church, but it repudiates all authority of one group of Christians over another except the authority of love, of persuasion, of the Spirit. 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty'; and the legal or quasi-political control of one group of Christians by another, the restraint or delaying of one group by the checks of an elaborate ecclesiastical machinery are at variance with the liberty of the Spirit and the ultimate responsibility of each Christian group to Christ alone. The spiritual autonomy of the local group of Christians is a life-giving and necessary principle.

It is not here maintained that Congregationalists have always or ever been wholly loyal to their principle, nor that they have rightly and truly interpreted it, nor that this principle solves the problems of Church organization in this or any age. There are other principles and varied expediencies to be considered, but the general principle must stand that the conscience of any Christian group is to be respected as the conscience of the individual, and that neither the individual Christian nor the group of believers can be sundered from the one Church of God if they are loyal to the will of Christ as they are able to apprehend it. The unity of the Christian

Church must not be inconsistent with the spiritual liberty of its constituent parts. The authority of the Church must be spiritual and moral, not legal and coercive.

It is freely to be admitted that the Congregational principle presupposes that the local group or Church consists of those who are true Christians, men and women filled with the Spirit and sincerely seeking the will and guidance of God, and that no Christian group does in fact attain to more than an approximation to this requirement. A consideration of the truly crucial question whether the Church should be united and organized upon anything less than an ideal basis is beyond the scope of this article.

II.

The Congregational Churches have from time to time put forth professions of faith, and every Church is under obligation to proclaim in intelligible terms that which it believes. But the Congregational Churches have generally declined to be committed to credal statements. This does not involve that any doctrine whatsoever may be legitimately proclaimed from Congregational pulpits, for it is presupposed that the Church consists of those who believe in God through Christ, who have received the Holy Spirit and who look to Christ alone for salvation; but to any particular doctrinal or theological statement the Congregational Churches are not committed. This is beyond doubt an asset of the greatest value for the facing of the problems of the modern world. Congregational Churches consist of Christian men—that is the assumption—but these Christian men have no sacred formula, no theological system which they must seek to defend; they have the completest intellectual liberty for the defining, expounding, defending, rationalizing of the Christian experience of God in Christ. They have an unchanging gospel to proclaim but no transitory formula which they must defend.

It should, then, be clear that the Congregational Churches, where they are loyal to their real meaning, are not undogmatic; for it is not possible to make any purely religious statement that does not rest upon dogma or presuppose theology. Congregationalists are not free to deny the gospel, but they are free to express the gospel in any terms that seem appropriate and adequate in any generation.

III.

Beyond question clericalism or officialdom has been a bane in Christendom. Protestants have frequently pointed to the Roman Church as priest-ridden, but in fact clerical prestige, clerical conservatism, clerical control have been conspicuous in Protestantism also. If clericalism is almost of necessity the enemy of freedom and of progress, the repudiation of a trained and professional ministry seems not less to lead to disaster. Theology is not religion; none the less, solid learning and systematic thought are a necessary function of any Church that would appeal to the judgment and understanding of men. The danger of a clerical class is that the denomination so easily becomes a vested interest; it is the task of an official to keep the machine in smooth working order, and his livelihood depends upon the machine; but machinery is often the antithesis of life; the free and independent search for truth is made difficult when unorthodox conclusions might prejudice the successful functioning of the Church and jeopardize the livelihood of their professor. It is probably true that Congregationalism has been more successful than other denominations in producing at once a competently trained ministry and a Church life free from the dead hand of tradition and the retarding effect of ecclesiastical machinery. It is in this matter that Congregationalism has a marked advantage over against Continental Protestantism in particular.

IV.

The distinctive element in Congregational organization is the Church meeting. It is the assembly of the adult members of the Church for the discussion and decision of the problems of Church life. The Church meeting under the guidance of the Spirit appoints the officers of the Church, including the minister, decides all questions of order, discipline, extension, and organization, except such as have been delegated by the Church to particular officers or committees, and is ultimately responsible for the teaching given by the minister; for the minister preaches not only to the Church, but on behalf of the Church and in the Church's name. At the Church meeting the minister normally presides, yet the government of the Church is entirely democratic. It is based upon the assumption that all Church members have received the same Spirit, the same anointing from above (in spite of diversities of gifts), and that all alike have 'the mind of Christ.' Hence the term 'democratic' as applied to a Church meeting is not to be understood in its modern political sense. A Congregational Church is not, or should not be, governed by majority votes, and every minute of

the Church meeting should ideally begin with the words, 'It seemed good unto the Holy Ghost and to us.'

The Church meeting is one of the peculiar glories of Congregationalism viewed theoretically and sometimes viewed historically; it is a glory to which the eyes of many Congregational Churches are, in fact, not always open. Congregationalism in its *a priori* aspect is essentially an ideal system: Congregationalism is empirically a far from ideal denomination. One is tempted to add the words *ça va sans dire*, but that the religion of the New Testament gives little warrant for such a comment.

V.

Each branch of the Christian Church tends to produce a distinctive type of character or of saint. Every truly Christian man belongs to the whole Church and not to his own denomination alone, and, more particularly in these days when there is much passing to and fro between denominations, there is no clear-cut Congregational type; but the Congregational principle as expressed in the institution of the Church meeting has produced and is producing men of a certain mould whose influence in history has been great. Those accustomed to gather as God's free men in the Church meeting, to discuss and decide upon spiritual issues without interference or domination of prelate or outside authority, are not likely to brook tyranny and despotism in the State. It was such men as these who as the Pilgrim Fathers ventured across the seas to found a new world based on political and religious freedom, and who as the Independents were the backbone of the great rebellion against the impositions, duplicities, and tyranny of the Stuart dynasty. Congregationalists have no monopoly of social service, but the Puritan and Reformed (as opposed to the Lutheran or Arminian) tradition of which they are heirs has led them to stand for political freedom, for social righteousness and an active participation in politics on the progressive side.

Such in the main has been the distinctive Congregational witness. It is easy but somewhat unprofitable and discouraging to show that at no time has Congregationalism grasped the full implications of its principle, or been loyal to such vision as it had. Reliance upon the civil power, adhesion to the letter of Scripture, insistence upon a particular orthodoxy, acquiescence in an ethic recognized to be sub-Christian, have been or are observable in Congregationalism, but these things are inconsistencies; they are due to the blindness of men, not to the defects of a principle.

At the present day most Congregationalists are such either because their fathers were Congregationalists or because they derive help from some local Congregational minister. The ordinary Congregationalist is not bound to his denomination by any bond such as would make it difficult or impossible for him to join a Wesleyan, a Quaker, or an Anglican Church. Conversely it is not clear that a Wesleyan, a Quaker, or an Anglican who became convinced of the truth of the fundamental Congregational position would feel himself thereby obliged to sever his connexion with his own denomination by joining a Congregational Church. Only in a very general way, or, perhaps rather, only through a minority of its members, is the Congregational denomination the custodian of the Congregational principle. The Congregational *principle* of the Liberty of the Christian group, as of the Christian man, is assured of life, whatever happens to Congregationalism, because it is logically and necessarily involved in the creative Christian experience itself. The Congregational *denomination* is assured of no such immortality and triumph; its future, like and with that of all other Protestant denominations, is a matter upon which no wise man would care to speak with assurance. Like other denominations Congregationalism draws to itself adherents on adventitious grounds that have nothing whatever to do with its distinctive principle; and, whereas the principle is of universal application to all Christian groups, Congregationalism as a denomination offers little variety of worship or organization and appeals to-day to a limited section of the population.

What, then, is the contribution of Congregationalism to the future or to the whole Church Catholic? It is, or it may be, threefold:

(*a*) The Congregational Union, which constitutes the Congregational denomination, is a free association of Independent Churches for mutual help and support and for common service at home and abroad. The denomination as such has central offices and officials, a large income and many corporate institutions and activities. In so far as it is loyal to its own principle, it will succeed in demonstrating to the whole Church, that unity and effective corporate life on a very large scale are compatible with the assured and unquestioned liberty of the individual group; in other words, that legal sanction and compulsive force are not necessary for the unity of Christendom. But Congregationalism inevitably breaks down when and in so far as the

constituent Churches are not in fact composed of men and women who have received the illumination of the Spirit.

(*b*) The greatest contribution of Congregationalism will lie and has lain in actual, living, local Christian Churches which without any outside authority and in reliance upon the guidance of Christ alone have organized their Church life, served their neighbourhood, and built up a Christian community having, under human limitations, all the marks of a true Church, unity, catholicity, and holiness. There is no gainsaying a real Congregational Church; such there has been and such there is still.

(*c*) The Congregational principle of spiritual autonomy within the sphere of the Gospel is a true principle, though the denomination should collapse (which God forbid) through the infidelity of the individual Churches. There are already signs (notably Dr. John Oman's book 'The Church and the Divine Order') that the Congregational principle is no monopoly of those called Congregationalists. The unity of the Church of the future must be not inconsistent with the liberty of the Christian man, and the liberty of the Christian group, and the spiritual authority of the whole Church as based upon that one creative experience of God in Christ which constitutes men Christians.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Footsteps.[1]

'My footsteps.'—Ps 17[5].

Did you ever hear of Sir John Franklin? Some eighty years ago he set out with two ships to try to fight his way through the long terrible north-west passage up in the Arctic, and they got lost somewhere in those white wastes. For years no news of them came through, till people got anxious, and expedition after expedition went to look for them. For a long time they learned nothing at all, and then at last slowly, bit by bit, the truth came out. An old Eskimo woman was met one day somewhere up there. She couldn't speak English, but she understood they were seeking for some lost men, and she acted a little play to them—how, oh, a long time ago, a few men had trailed past, dreadfully tired and lean, footsore and limping, yet staggering along. And then she pointed the way they had gone. So they set off in that direction. And another day, still searching here and seeking there, they came upon footsteps, fresh footsteps in the snow, and thought, 'people who might know something of the missing men have passed this way quite lately,' and they pushed on. And by and by they came upon a camp—a white man's camp—and ran to it. And then they stopped short, staring hard, with something gripping at their hearts. For there, sitting in a circle, were some of Sir John Franklin's men, their clothes laid out to dry, and everything looking as if they had just arrived. And yet they had been dead for years! And with them was a record, telling how the ships had got caught in the ice, how after some two years the food was failing, and Sir John Franklin had died; and so those that were left had broken up into small parties, and set off, hoping to find some way home. But they could go no farther; they were starved and tired out: it was over. A sad little tale! But what struck me most was those footsteps, quite fresh footsteps in the snow. And yet they were made years before. I should have thought that they would have been covered over by fresh falls, or that the sunshine of the short summer yonder would have melted them. But, no. Days, weeks, months, years after the men were dead their footsteps were still plain and clear for any one to see.

Well, you and I had better think of that. For we, too, are always making footsteps. And years and years after this some of them will still be there. 'Nonsense,' you say; 'I go down into town, and next day who can know about it? My feet left no mark on the hard pavements; or, if they did, well then the prints are already smudged and blotted out by all the others who have passed since then.' I know. Yet we are making other footprints, and they last. You know quite well we do leave footsteps. Mother comes home, and 'Tommie has been in,' she says at once. Yet you aren't there, and the house is still and quiet, no racket, never a sound or sign of you! How does she know? Why, by your footsteps left quite plain—lumps of mud off your shoes upon the

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

carpets, a litter of things on the floor, the cushions crushed into a heap. You're not there, but, like Friday on his island, you have left footsteps on the sand. People have only to go up to your room to know what kind of boy or girl you are. If there's a heap of clothes on every chair, and a huddle of things pitched anyhow on the floor and a mass of odds and ends upon the dressing-table, 'Humph!' they will say, 'a pigsty of a room like this shows what kind of a creature lives in it.' Your footsteps are left staring in the snow, though you have been away for hours.

Sometimes they last for years. If you bigger ones are cross to Mother, just you watch, and you'll see how the younger ones will start that too. They'll follow in your footsteps; yes, even after you are grown up and are far away. Or if you're slack at sticking into lessons, they'll be apt to drift along just like you too. You know how on the moors every one follows where the path has been beaten by others, and goes twisting through the heather.

Or if you can't be bothered turning out at games, don't care what happens to the School, are too lazy to do your part for it, well you are doing what you can to set up a tradition, and other fellows down the years will likely follow and be lazy and mean-spirited and selfish too; till at last, some big-hearted chap comes along, thinks of the School, and works for it, and starts a new tradition, and every one begins to follow in his footsteps, and to play the game like him. Oh, we leave footsteps all the time, and they may last so very long. And where are yours taking those who come after you? Do yours lead down, or up; on and on to a camp of death, or home?

Learning to Fly.[1]

'Oh that I had wings like a dove!'—Ps 55[6].

Many a boy wishes that he could fly like a bird. And I heard of a girl not very long ago who was standing in a field when an airman landed in his aeroplane, and took her up for a flight, and she enjoyed it very much. And not only boys and girls, but great kings have longed to do what the birds do. For instance, there was a king in Egypt who used to lie all day on his couch watching the birds and wondering how he could fly too. But I would like to tell you, boys and girls, just exactly what you would need to do if you wanted to fly an aeroplane well.

[1] By the Reverend T. Crouther Gordon, B.D., Pitlochry.

I remember the first time that I was taken up in an aeroplane. There were two of us in it—the instructor and myself. It was a very interesting aeroplane, and I was busy watching the propeller going round and the wings and the rudder and the tail, and trying to count the wires and the struts, when suddenly, above the noise of the engine, the man in front shouted, 'Strap yourself in!' And that was a very wise thing to say, for in the air the machine is very unsteady, and if you loop the loop without being strapped in, you might fall out and then nothing could save you. A chum who was a pilot along with me met me one day after he had been up in his machine, and I noticed he was very pale. He told me, 'I was just going to loop the loop when I saw that I was not strapped in.' So you see it is best to strap yourself in. But of course, boys and girls, it is just the same in life. Life is very unsteady. Sometimes we are turned upside down. Father dies and the home has to be broken up. Your little chum leaves the district and you feel lonely. Or perhaps, later on when you are working you lose your job. And the best thing for you is to strap yourself to the Church. It has stood the test for two thousand years, and you will always be safe in working for what is good inside the Church.

There was another thing I noticed just when we were going into the air. The pilot watched which way the wind was blowing, and moving to the other end of the aerodrome he turned the head of the machine into the wind, and so flew into the air. And he told me, what I want to tell you, that in flying you must always 'take off' into the wind. Now that seems a foolish thing, because the wind just keeps you back. You cannot fly so quickly if you are flying right into the teeth of the wind. And yet if you do not do that the wind will turn your machine over on its side and you will get into a 'sideslip,' your machine will crash, and you will be killed. So, you see, you must always face the wind. Now it is exactly the same with yourself. You have some things that keep you back. You have not the chance that the fellow next door has. You are away from school every winter with a cold, and so you are behind the other boys. Your father cannot give you as much pocket money as the boy next door. You are not going to get a fine education like the doctor's little boy. Well, then, do not turn your back but face your difficulties. Work all the harder, be all the more careful with your pennies, study in your spare time. Remember that no man has done so much for India as Lord Curzon, and he had to have a

special steel waistcoat to protect his body because his health was so bad. And you can do as great things if, like the pilot, you will face the things that keep you back.

But the third thing I noticed when we were flying in the air was that the pilot had many instruments in front of him. One told him what height he was. Another told him how quickly the propeller was running. Another told him where the North was. But there was one instrument his eye never left, for it told him how he was flying. It is called the 'sideslip indicator,' and acts like a spirit-level, but among ourselves we just called it the 'bubble.' And the great point to remember, if you want to fly well, is always to keep your eye on the 'bubble.' If you do not do that you lose control of the machine and it will crash to the ground. In a mist you cannot tell where you are, and your 'bubble' alone saves you. You must always keep your eye on the 'bubble.'

And it is no different, boys and girls, if you want to do well in life. But you ask me, 'What bubble have I got to keep my eye on?' And sure enough, God has been good enough to give you just the very thing. One boy calls it his soul; another his conscience. But it never fails to tell us whether we are flying right or wrong.

Do you want to be a good pilot? Then do these three things: Strap yourself in. 'Take off' into the wind. Watch the 'bubble.' And if you want to be a good man or a good woman the best plan is to do just the same.

The Christian Year.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

Was Christ the Product of His Time?

'As a root out of a dry ground.'—Is 53^2.

Was Christ simply the product of His time? Can we account for His spirit and character by the world into which He was born? Can we trace His teaching to any of the religions then existing in Judaism, Greece, Rome, or the East? Was the teaching of Jesus in line with the central spirit and aim of these religions?

1. It was natural that the Jews, having alone received a pure worship, should think themselves the chosen of Heaven; it would perhaps be beyond mere human nature not to regard other nations with contempt. When their Holy Books were translated into Greek, it was regarded in Jerusalem 'as a bitter day, like the day when the golden calf was made.' The later Rabbis laid on those who gave their sons Greek learning the same curse as on possessors of swine. The evidence might be multiplied almost endlessly; but one example from the life of Jesus shows the lengths to which this hostility towards the Gentiles carried His fellow-countrymen. When in the synagogue at Nazareth He ventured to say that prophets of Israel were sent to a heathen man and a heathen widow, His neighbours, shocked at His impiety, attempted to fling Him headlong from the brow of the hill.

Had Jesus been merely the child of His time and country He must have shared this central spirit of His race. If so, how comes it that His teaching has passed from land to land with its universal appeal of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, inspiring its followers with the ambition of winning the world for Christ? When the Greeks wished to see Him, He saw in their desire the call to that lifting up on the Cross which should draw all men unto Him. Because Jesus is not the child of His time, He is the child of all times.

But let us pursue this into further detail.

(1) One would think that Christ's attitude to the *Pharisees*, and theirs to Him, would at once disprove the idea that He drew His teaching from any of their Rabbis. The Gospels are full of denunciations of their righteousness. By their oral traditions they made void the commandments of God, making the Sabbath a burden, rendering it possible for a son in the name of duty to God to allow his parents to starve, discussing trivialities such as whether it is the temple or the gold of the temple which makes an oath binding. To Him, who came not to destroy the Law but to fulfil it, such teaching 'made void' the commandments of God given through Moses. Nevertheless, while they spun the weighty matters of the Law—justice, mercy, faith—into an endless web of casuistries, He went straight to the central spirit of all law, the spirit of love. He denounced the externality of their righteousness.

(2) Turn now to the priestly and aristocratic class in Israel—the *Sadducees*. They accepted the Law, but rejected the Pharisaic comments and traditions. In Moses they found nothing about a future life, so they denied the Pharisees' doctrine of a Kingdom of God beyond the grave, a world of spirits and angels, where men receive rewards after the resurrection. To the Sadducees the Kingdom of God was on earth, in Palestine; the reward, material prosperity, long life and abundant posterity in which alone a man finds his resurrection. We can judge for ourselves whether

Christ is indebted to them for His doctrine of the future world with its rewards and punishments, and His teaching about the resurrection.

(3) We come now to the *Essenes*. They were a brotherhood of Jewish monks with a reverence for the Law so great that to speak against it was accounted worthy of death. They did not go up to the sacrifices in the Temple, because their own meals were their sacrifices. They kept the Sabbath with more than Pharisaic strictness. They considered the body as impure and evil. Wine and meat were shunned; bread and water were their food and drink; marriage was forbidden among the majority of them; money was not used; property was held in common. Separation from the world, abandonment even of Israel, was the central idea of this sect. Morally it was by far the purest section of Palestine, but it refused to mix with even its own countrymen.

Now, some say that Christ was a member of this community, and that from its teaching He drew His doctrines of love to God and love to man. Let us, then, compare His way of showing love to man with that of the Essenes. His first public act was to leave the wilderness, go to a marriage feast, and make wine for the guests. Again, Christ refused to allow the Sabbath to become a burden by its strictness. He discountenanced the merely ceremonial ablutions of the Pharisees. While He doubtless recognized the need for reasonable hygienic laws, He condemned over-carefulness in the matter of what it was lawful to eat and drink by declaring that a man is defiled only by the evil thoughts coming out of his own heart. He mixed freely with every class of society, even the outcasts, accepting invitations to dine with Pharisees and publicans alike. Above all, the Essenes retired to the desert, abandoning a world which they despaired to save. Jesus set His face steadfastly to go to Jerusalem to lay down His life for the salvation of all mankind.

No, Jesus Christ is not the product of His age and land, any more than He would be the product of ours if He were born here and now. The contempt of the Jew for others was so natural that we can only account for its absence in Christ by seeking for the reason in some source higher than our foolish human nature. The Pharisee made the Law a thing of letter and rule; Jesus made it a thing of life and spirit. The Sadducee denied the immortality of the human soul and made the earth all; Jesus gave to the soul hopes which demanded eternity and were themselves the earnest of its immortality. The Essene counted the touch of the world pollution; Jesus walked straight into that world, mixed with its very outcasts, laid down His life to redeem it. He stands out from His surroundings as separate and original.

2. No one has suggested that Jesus drew any part of His religion from ancient *Rome*. So we turn now to *Greece*—to intellect refined to the point of beauty. The Greek worshipped the human mind, and his wisdom penetrated even Judaism, so that some think it has, in some measure, influenced the religion of Jesus. Now, let us take the opinion of one who has earned the right to judge. To the Apostle Paul the central thing in Christianity was 'Jesus Christ and him crucified.' In that broken, dying form on the Cross he saw the very image of God. But to the Greek, he says, this Cross which is the wisdom of God is foolishness. For the Greeks sought after wisdom, the wisdom of their own philosophies, and what could a crucified man be but foolishness? How could His marred form be the image of their bright and beautiful deities incapable of suffering? Socrates declares that there would be 'great impropriety' in the gods having either joy or sorrow; and Aristotle in his conception of them shuts them up in mere contemplation of themselves. Now this, perhaps the loftiest Greek wisdom concerning the Divine nature, declares that it is the very blessedness of God that He is incapable of entering into human life in love or action. Obviously this would make the very idea of an Incarnation an absurdity. When Jesus says, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father,' He contradicts absolutely the whole Greek conception of God. 'God,' He says in effect, 'is not thus so absorbed in love and contemplation of Himself that He is incapable of loving His creatures; He is not so lifted like a marble statue that He cannot suffer in order to redeem, for it is written, "I have made and I will bear."'

3. We turn now to the East. *Buddha*, 'the Enlightened One,' lived nearly six centuries before Christ; and many hold that Christianity has borrowed from Buddhism its leading doctrines. There are certainly some strange resemblances. But the central spirit of Buddhism is pessimism and despair. The fundamental conviction is that existence in every form is sorrow. Salvation is to escape absolutely out of existence by killing out that desire of life which betrays us to continue living by the delusive hope that life will bring happiness. By salvation, Buddha meant the final extinction of life; Jesus meant 'life, and life more abundant': Buddha meant sinking into absolute

unselfconsciousness ; Jesus meant rising into a more and more vivid consciousness of self in God. He came in order to prove that joy is at the heart of the universe, and to give life more abundant.[1]

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

Christ's Call to Rest.

'Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest a while.'—Mk 6^{31}.

These words bring before us Jesus Christ as '*a Man of rest.*' Of Christ as a worker we have often heard. Jesus was indeed a toiler above all men. His life was a short one. Three-and-thirty years covered its brief span. Yet He put more into it than a Methuselah. As soon as boyhood was past, He went to toil at the carpenter's bench, and, when He left that, it was to crowd into three short years the work of a life that was to regenerate the world. How long did Jesus work? The early morning found Him praying on the mountain-top—the noontide found Him tramping from city to city, and the evening found Him still at His healing work.

And yet, though Jesus was emphatically a Man of work, He was also a Man of rest. There were times when in the very midst of His activities He would suddenly leave it all, pass into the solitudes, and not return until His wonted calm of mind was restored. Such a time was this in the Saviour's life. He was now at the very height of His activities. The multitudes were thronging Him, so that He had time 'not so much as to eat.' It must have been a real joy thus to see His work going forward from triumph to triumph, yet it was just then that He stopped it all. A short message is brought Him—John the Baptist is dead, slain by the cruelty of a vindictive woman. Jesus recognizes in it a call to the solitudes, a call to rest, and meditation, and prayer. 'Come ye yourselves apart,' He says to the disciples, 'into a desert place, and rest a while.'

Now this call which Jesus addressed to His disciples is one He addresses to us. We live, too, in an age of toil and care. The noise of its machinery is clanging in our ears. Those of us who are in it are swept off our feet by a congestion of engagements and occupations so incessant that we have sometimes little time to eat; while, if we are not in it, if, owing to some great industrial dispute, the wheels are no longer moving, the silence does not mean for us rest. Rather the reverse. It speaks of anxious care to employer and employed alike. It follows them into their hours of unemployment with a burden more heavy even than that of work. It is an age of work, or, what is worse, of want of work.

Now, what is the danger of this fever and fret of our modern life? The danger is that in the midst of our work we are apt to forget the worker, that our inner life becomes flat and stale and unprofitable, that we develop into mere machines.

Is there not a similar danger, too, in our religious life? Is not the lack of rest, the lack of depth, the great want in our religious life to-day? There never was an age of such Christian activity as ours. The activities of a former day were entirely concentrated on worship; now we have societies of all kinds, for young and old, meetings all the week through, conferences and associations of every kind. It is, no doubt, a vast improvement on the old type of Church life in many respects; and yet is there not a danger in it too—the danger of becoming factory looms, grinding out our yard of Christian work but with no hidden life, no deep experience behind it? The ordinary services of the Church it finds dull and lifeless. It lives on excitement. It has no restfulness, no meditation in its life. It has never gone with Jesus into the 'desert place to rest a while.'

1. Let us look at one or two of these resting-places, and let us begin with what is suggested by our text, *the rest which is produced by any outward change in our surroundings.*

'Come ye apart into a *desert* place.' It was away from the ordinary haunts of men that Jesus called His disciples, out of the current of life into some quiet place. Such a habit, we know, was familiar to Jesus. The night with its starry solitudes, the mountains with their calm peace, even the stormy waters of the lake of Galilee—these were the resting-places of Him who had nowhere else to 'rest his head.' This, then, is one of the resting-places of the tired spirit, a change in the outward environment of our life to the solitudes. Such a change, indeed, has now almost become a necessity of our existence. Summer by summer our cities empty themselves far and wide; some to seashore and island, others to quiet countryside or mountain glen. It is a great rest, a welcome break in the monotony of life.

But, while thus our bodies are refreshed, let us not forget that our spirits need refreshment too. 'Come ye apart and rest a while' is what Christ says to our souls as well. See in the rest of Nature a call to a deeper rest than Nature alone can bestow. Surely even to the most prosaic there is a ministry

[1] J. S. Carroll, *The Motherhood of God*, 53.

in Nature, something that appeals to our deepest longings. That wild and restless sea, does it not speak to our restless spirits of that troubled sea within, which can never be at peace till Christ says to it, 'Be still!'? And these great mountains, always peaceful, have they not a message to our souls of that 'peace which passeth all understanding'? Yes, surely God speaks to us in this resting-place, if only we have ears to hear, of that rest which remaineth for the people of God.'

2. Once again, *worship*, either the worship of the sanctuary, or the worship of 'the secret place' of individual prayer, is another of life's resting-places.

It is not always possible to change our outward surroundings, but there is one resting-place which is always open to the troubled soul, the resting-place of prayer. Some one has said that 'prayer is the well-spring of character.' As the river draws its streams of refreshing water from the solitude of the hills—far off from the city through which it flows—so every strong character draws its supplies from the solitudes too, the solitudes of prayer and thought. A great man once said, 'I am too busy to be in a hurry.' He meant that if he were in a hurry he would lose that quiet self-possession which is essential in doing work effectively. Worker as He was, Jesus was never in a hurry. He had always twelve hours for His day of life. And the secret of it was prayer. He did His great work as Nature does hers, quietly, without bustle or strain.

3. There is one more resting-place which comes to our thoughts, *the resting-place of Communion with God at the Holy Table.*

This is the resting-place of companionship. There are some people who dwell in the House of Quiet. No matter how jaded our spirits may be when we go to see them their presence exerts a healing influence on our whole being. To have a talk with them is to bring our souls into an atmosphere of peace. Men of all kinds and classes came to Jesus—who possessed this gift as no other—and they found rest to their souls. Here was One who knew all their weariness and their pain, One whose very look and voice and healing touch chased away all their troubles as the morning sunlight chases away the shadows of the night. It is to such a fellowship that our Lord calls us. Weary, vexed, and troubled as some of us may be, tired as we all are at times with the burden of life, this is what He says to us as we draw near to the Lord's Table: 'Come ye apart and rest a while.' It may be that some of us are like Christ also in this, that we are sitting under the shadow of a recent bereavement. It was the death of His beloved Forerunner that drove Him at this time into the solitudes. But whatever be our need or condition, let us hear Christ's call: 'Come ye apart into a desert place and rest a while.' Blessed the man who hears the call of Jesus to such a resting-place. The desert is no longer desert when He is there. 'The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for him, and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose.'[1]

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Call of Christ.

'He, trembling and astonished, said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?'—Ac 9^{6}.

The conversion of Paul is one of the most remarkable things in history. Explain it as we will, it can never be explained away. Critics have dealt with the outward signs, the light and the voice and the other accompaniments, and some have tried to belittle them. These are not the important things. The thing which *is* important is the life which resulted from the experience, and that is the thing which will not dissolve in the acid of criticism. The miracle is not Paul's conversion—it is Paul's career.

One of the outstanding things in the conversion itself is the completeness of Paul's surrender to Jesus. Doubtless the ferment of Christianity had been working secretly in his unconscious mind. Down in the depth of his nature the conflict had been going on for long. The light (of unresisting love) on Stephen's dying face had struck deep into his soul and stirred a nest of uncomfortable suggestions. But, however it was, there was nothing half-hearted in his surrender to Christ. It was a case of perfect abandonment. He fell on his face, trembling and astonished, and said, 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?' These words, on the surface, suggest a man whose life has been brought to wreck and ruin around him, and who is at his wits' end—the condition, as the Psalmist tells us, in which a man is ready to make a beginning with God, and God is able to take charge of his life. But there was more in the cry than sheer despair, for Paul was not in the habit of using words rashly. There were two things in it to which we ought to give our minds.

1. There was the *instinct for action*, and the acknowledgment that religion demands activity. 'What wilt thou have me to *do*?' Like every-

[1] W. Mackintosh Mackay, *Days of the Son of Man*, 235.

thing else, Christianity must find expression in action, for genuine life produces activity. Every living thought blazes a path for itself in words or deeds. Every deep emotion must find a channel. There is very little Christianity about a man if it is not making him do something. There is very little fire in the locomotive if it is not transforming its energy into motion. When God sought to reveal His highest thought, He put it into a *life*. Real religion is not a theology to be argued about, it is a life to be lived. The trouble with many people is that they use worship as a lightning conductor for religious emotion to pass harmlessly away, instead of finding some contact with life's tasks or duties in which that emotion can become vital and dynamic.

2. Further, religious activity is the *activity of the whole life directed by Jesus*. The whole man must be in it—the praying man, the loving man, and the working man. When Paul said, 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?' he put his whole life at the disposal of Jesus. He gave into the hands of Christ the steering-wheel and the engine control and stood by to obey orders. He made Christ Master of the ship. He hailed Christ Lord of his whole personality. His thinking was to be guided by Christ, for in Christ he recognized the truth. His ambition was to be directed by Christ, for in Christ he had found life's glorious objective. He would take up whatever work Christ bade him do. He was ready to scrap all the old life, work and friendships, career and habits, in order that Christ might reconstruct his life from its foundations. Everything was flung into the melting-pot to be run into the moulds and reshaped by Christ. Other men since his day have done the same thing, and made a completely fresh beginning. Francis of Assisi left behind him the whole furniture of a rich man's life and went out to found a new order of Christian service. Brother Lawrence, after being a footman and a soldier, put his life at the disposal of Christ and found his sphere of labour in the kitchen of a Carmelite Monastery. However impossible such revolutionary changes of calling may seem to us in our own situation, they light up the meaning of Christianity, which is a life set at the disposal of Christ. 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?'

This brings before us the whole question of the call of Christ and our daily calling. The truth faces us at once from this cry of Paul, that a man's daily calling must be part of the expression of his Christian life. There, as elsewhere, Christ must direct and control. To shut the office door or the factory gate upon Christ is to deny the mastership of Jesus in the most essential part of our life. For a Christian man, the phrase that 'business is business' in the meaning some give to it, is a denial of Christ's right to rule. 'I mean to live,' said a man once, 'and to have no gaps of death in the middle of my life.'

We cannot close our eyes to the fact that this opens up a good many difficulties. For one thing, if our work is to be Christian, we must be sure we are doing the thing Christ wants us to do. We must be sure we have a task which can express a Christian personality. Can a Christian man possibly find a legitimate calling in providing degrading entertainments, or unworthy literature, or make a profit out of trades which are poisonous to the moral and physical well-being of those who are engaged in them? The problem for a man in such a situation is one which he will have to face for himself by the light of his own conscience. It may be his duty to go out of a calling or business which offers a perpetual rebuke to conscience, if he is unable to change the conditions.

The point is that the truth of Christ in our souls must find outlet in our calling. Every part of life must give expression to the mind which has been touched by the redeeming power of Jesus. If we are His, our work must show it. It may be the right thing for us is not to leave our post but to stay there and work steadily for changing the conditions, bringing a new conscience into a degrading business to sweep it clean of all that is unworthy of truth and love. The business of a Christian society is to create a conscience about bad conditions and unworthy occupations. But the path for each individual is the path that opens up in answer to that surrender to Christ—to that cry, 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?'

The world is in sore need of men and women in definite Christian service at home and abroad, but the world is dying for men and women who will find in their work a sacred call and see in it a means of expressing their loyalty to Christ. What we need to-day, as some one says, is 'the spiritual mind in the man of the world.' Our choice of a profession must not be governed by the money we can earn or the profit we can win. The money pull in industry is the root of half our troubles. When the quality of work is confused with the quantity of wages, and our service is determined by our rewards, the devil gets into the business and our life goes off the rails.

But what of those who have no choice, or have made their choice before they became alive to Christ,

and now find all other doors are shut? It may be we are in a situation where, in the light of some new experience, we should like to change our calling. Many have already drifted into their niche by compulsions not of their own making. What are we to say to them? The word for them is surely this—that the compulsions of life must be accepted as the call of God. If we are in a place from which there is no escaping, that place is for us the place of our calling.

Are there no changes we can make in the quality of our work, if not in the form of it? Would it not make a difference to the whole standard of life's comfort and the prosperity of our fellows if we took Christ into the workshop with us and made our toil a fellowship with Him? Would it not change the dingiest workshop into something like a temple if we knelt in spirit at the bench at the day's beginning, like a priest at his altar, and sought to consecrate our gifts and our tools to Christ?

Our work, whatever it be, is only a channel. The task of a Christian man is the revelation of Jesus. That is our business. Paul had to leave his early calling and scour the face of Europe with his gospel to do it. He revealed Christ with his mind, his tongue, his method, his friendship. He revealed Him in the helping hand he held out to others, in the courage and patience of his great soul liberated by faith amid a tangle of difficulties in victorious service. There is no part of our life in which the light of Christian character may not break through some chink or cranny. So far as we are Christian we are translating Christ to the world in everything we do, as Christ revealed something of Himself in every situation. And a man can translate Christ to his fellows in the language of a finished piece of work, in its limited degree, as clearly as he can in a book or a poem or a sermon.[1]

Fourth Sunday after Epiphany.

The Group.

'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.'—Mt 18^{20}.

It is clear that if the disciple is meant to go alone, he is also meant to go in company. There is a lonecraft which the soul has to learn; but he is called at the same time to belong to a company. He is incomplete if either the solitary communion or the fellowship is wanting. The Christian disciple cannot afford either to be never alone, or to be always alone. To settle the right proportions is one of the tasks upon which the beauty and perfection of the Christian life depends. The balance is hard to attain, but it is worth attaining.

We shall not think of the 'two or three' as living all their life together. Each will have his own life in God; each will have large reserves and secret dealings with his Lord; but they will move none the less in company to the City.

There will be the conversion of groups already existing into pilgrim bands. Sometimes it is the family that is remade. The old bonds are there still, only now they are raised to a new sacredness. Andrew and Simon are still brothers; so are James and John, and perhaps others in the circle of the Apostles. It is significant that among the very few names recorded in the New Testament there are so many brothers or members of the same family enrolled in the family of God. The sons of Simon of Cyrene; Rufus and his mother; Aquila and Priscilla, husband and wife; and others might be named.

But there were other, and entirely fresh, associations formed in that Apostolic Age. Some who had never known each other in the old life were drawn together in the love of Christ. They had each of them a past unshared. They were like men who have come across the sea to a new settlement, beginning life again and knowing each other only under their new sky. The Master had said that they who lost father or mother, sister or brother, should find abundant more in this world. This they proved to be true. Groups were formed everywhere after the manner of the family. St. Paul, speaking of Rufus, adds, 'and his mother and mine.' He had been adopted into that family; everywhere in his travels he had homes and peaceful family circles, where he was welcomed. His life was not all storm and tumult; there were many ports of call.

In a sermon on this text Dr. Fort Newton says: 'In the front yard of our home there stood a great old tree, under which some who are fallen asleep were wont to sit on Sabbath afternoons and talk of the things of the soul. Nearly always they had their Bibles open on their laps, and sometimes they would argue a point of doctrine. More often, however, their talk was of the inner life and its revealings and the things they had learned in the school of Christ. . . . How beautiful, yet how far away it all seems—almost as remote as my mother and her friends under the old tree five thousand miles away. Why do we not have such talk in our day? Why are we so reticent, so uncommunicative, so shy in respect of the inner

[1] J. Reid, *The Victory of God*, 184.

life of faith? Is it because we have nothing to talk about, because we have no "dealings" in these matters, as Silas Marner would say? Or is it due to an unsettlement of faith which makes us less certain, and therefore less talkative, than our fathers were?'[1]

What we need to-day is the recovery of the idea and uses of the group.

1. For the sake of *discoveries in the truth* the group is needed. There are certain phases of the truth which can be best understood by two or three; indeed, they are partly hidden from the solitary believer. It may even be said that every truth or experience has its phase which is understood and enjoyed in fellowship. It is not that the Faith changes under the pressure of the group, but it becomes more confident of itself. Doubts lose some of their terror; the soul enlarges its boundaries; it reaches heights which it had not reached alone. Where two or three meet together, what happens? Is it that there is a pooling of resources, so that each receives the faith and hope and love of the others? That in itself would be a wonderful gain; but what if they receive all this and something added! For lo! He is in the midst of them. And since the Christian gospel carries within it from the very beginning the demand for new social relationships, it must be by twos or threes this is known experimentally. 'Love of the brethren' is not a mere synonym for love; it is one of the distinctive gifts of the Christian Church to the world.

The Christian gospel comes to the world with a doctrine of the Divine life, with its own social bonds which are from eternity; but this doctrine of the Holy Blessed and Glorious Trinity involves those who believe it with all their hearts in an experiment: they must show forth their understanding in this mystery, not only in their confessions, but in the bonds that bind them together. They must live the Trinity.

2. Apart from discoveries in the truth, there is *much that pilgrims can do for each other*. Even when they cannot bear each other's burdens, and there are burdens which no soul can bear for another, they can encourage each other. There is a singular comfort from the memory that others, one with us in Christ, are saying: 'We know you are passing through deep waters; we cannot go with you, but our love is with you, and our faith; we know that you will not fail.'

Nor must we forget the power of the two or three to correct the individual soul. The very eagerness of the pilgrim may lead him into perils; he may be guarded by the wisdom and garnered experience of his fellows. Here once more the perpetual dilemma of the Christian life is reached—the soul must live alone, and at the same time must be cheered and corrected by its fellows. The mystic must be an associate of others; the lonely soul must join with others, even while it remains alone. 'There is no heresy so lamentable as that which conceited individualism preaches; no truth so sublime as that received by the true mystic from God.' How, then, is the true mystic to be saved from the errors of the fanatic? One of the safest of all means lies in the willingness of the true seer to share with others.

The group comes between the life in solitude and the life in the great assembly, but it is neither a substitute for the one life nor the other; it comes between and has its own place. We remember the 'twos and threes' in every age who have been drawn together and moved with quickened and firmer step to the City. There were the *Joculatores Dei* who sang their way through Italy; 'The Friends of God' in Germany; the family of Nicholas Ferrar at Little Gidding; the Holy Club in Oxford; the Early Tractarians. In none of these groups was there any failure to seek for God in the individual life, nor was there any coldness to the Church of Christ; but how beautiful and gracious was that intimate life which they shared. All that was pledged to them in their dream of the Church was lent to them in advance: they tasted already the good things of the age to come.[2]

Fifth Sunday after Epiphany.

Ways and Paths.

'In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths.'—Pr 3^6.

That is a great promise, one of the greatest of Scripture. Every earnest man would wish to believe that there is a Guiding Hand upon his life. Like all promises of the Bible, it is a promise with a condition, a condition not arbitrarily set, but essential in the very nature of things. A man must work with God, or God cannot work with him.

What does it mean to acknowledge God? First, that we are not to acknowledge God at times, about some things, but constantly and completely in all our ways. Is it not just at this point that many a man has to revise his religious life if it is to be thoroughgoing, if it is to be satisfying to himself

[1] J. Fort Newton, *The Sword of the Spirit*, 191.

[2] E. Shillito, *The Return to God*, 49.

and have the ring of reality to others? We incline, many of us, to confine God to certain parts, certain experiences of life—the critical decision, the great anxiety, the impending danger, the sickness that may mean death. But the thought that is most often with us in the intimacy of our souls, of what we would like to do, of what we would like to have, of what we would like to happen, somehow in this intensely vivid sphere of personality we do not think of God as we should. One feels at once that this was the big thing in the religion of Jesus. It concerned the whole of life, not a part of it. His Father's will, His Father's work, touched and transformed even the simplest things, the everyday contacts of life. It never seemed to enter our Lord's mind that life would be a less joyous thing for men if they acknowledged God in all their ways—the very reverse. 'Your Father knoweth' is His great word of every human experience. And Paul has the same thought of the universal concern of God with the whole of life. 'All things,' he says, 'work together (not singly) for good to those who love God.'

1. But what are these ways in all of which we are to acknowledge God? A way is a manner of living, a direction of thought and effort. A man's ways are his spiritual habits. First among these ways in which we must acknowledge God is the way of faith. We must be able to say to ourselves, not necessarily in all the detail of the historic creeds, but in their great overshadowing reality, 'I believe.' There are two things about faith which ought to be emphasized, choice and culture—the choice of faith and the culture of faith. We do not think of faith as a choice. We are apt to think that faith simply happens to some people, while it escapes others. Of course there is an environment of faith which makes it easier for a man to believe than if he were in another environment, and there are experiences which help faith as there are experiences which make it more difficult. But behind all this is choice, definite and concrete. In times when the foundations of life seem to totter, when the things that are shaken seem to be in the foreground, do I choose still to believe in God? 'For one,' Professor William James used to say to his students at Harvard, 'I choose to believe in God.' But it must be a persistent choice. We must choose over and over again. And so we need the culture of faith, definite means by which faith may be nourished and strengthened. Two such means suggest themselves—the reading every day of faith-building books, and especially the Book which is the great faith-builder, and the companionship of faith-building men and women. The father of John Ruskin wrote of him once, 'He has just gone from a hurried dinner to the sunset, which he visits as regularly as a soldier does his evening parade.' The strange thing is not that faith dies out in many men; the strange thing is that even in an anæmic form it survives, when we think how little heed they give to it, how little care to feed it and build it up.

Another of the ways in which we are to acknowledge God is the way of Prayer—not the careless muttering of formal prayers, not occasional prayer for something that seems to us essential in a fair-dealing universe, but that habit of mind which makes us recognize that there is One with us to whom our lives are a real concern and who is able to do for us exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think.

And then we acknowledge God by the way of Love. Love is a very large word. It includes, for instance, righteousness. We cannot love God and love men and have any crookedness in our dealings, any tortuous devices of self-deceit by which we delude ourselves with the thought that a good end will ever excuse a wrong means, or any twistings of self-interest by which we seek to combine the good opinion of men with some selfish scheme for our own material good. It includes forgiveness. Is there anything that is such an acknowledgment of Him, and anything the world so needs to-day as readiness to forgive.

> Hushed be every thought that springs
> From out the bitterness of things?

2. And now, the promise to the man who acknowledges God in all his ways is that God will direct his paths. There is a contrast to be noticed between ways and paths. Way is the more general word. A way is a manner of life, a general direction in which one chooses to go. It hints at a goal toward which one is pressing on. But a path is more definite and specific. It is the next step, the immediate line of progress. And the promise is that here, in the tracing out of life step by step, if we acknowledge God in all our ways, He will direct us: a firmer hand than ours will be on the helm. Often the course may seem dangerous and disastrous. Often there may seem to be no course at all. But never fear: we will reach the haven. This has not simply been the sustaining faith, but the transforming experience of some of the world's great leaders in many spheres of life, the place where, as it seemed to them in many a

perplexing day, faith gripped and became experience. Often it is only in the after-view that a man recognizes the Guiding Hand. 'Now I begin to understand,' wrote Hawthorne of his years as an assistant clerk in the custom-house, when, conscious of certain gifts, every opportunity for their exercise seemed to be denied him. 'Now I begin to understand why I was imprisoned so many years in this lonely chamber, and why I could never break through these viewless bolts and bars.'

There is one thing more to be said about the difference between a way and a path. A way may not have been trodden before: a path has. Peary found the way to the North Pole, Livingstone to the heart of Africa, but they found no path leading them there. They made the path for others. Do not let us forget that ours is a path that Christ has been over every step, that there is no experience of difficulty and darkness and antagonism which He does not know, and that He is by our side to guide us every day. In all Thy ways acknowledge Him and He will direct thy paths.[1]

[1] A. MacColl, *The Sheer Folly of Preaching*, 176.

Spiritual Power in Pagan Religions and in the Old Testament.

By the Reverend Campbell N. Moody, M.A., Missionary in Formosa.

It is often taken for granted that religious men of all races and creeds are at one in their desire for Divine aid in the struggle to live aright. But in the worship of many deities moral conduct is a matter of indifference, as when evil-doers pray for success in gambling, robbery, and deeds of shame, and the more virtuous seek nothing beyond health and wealth in return for their offerings. In other religions the higher powers condemn and perhaps punish wickedness, and approve righteousness: yet righteousness is the worshipper's own business; it does not even occur to him to look beyond himself for moral strength. Take an illustrious example: 'No one,' says Cicero, 'has ever put down his virtues to the gods' account, or thanked heaven for his courage' (see H. R. Mackintosh, *Originality of the Christian Message*, pp. 100–101).

These words may be regarded as a motto of Paganism in many of its ancient and modern forms. We are at present concerned mainly with pre-Christian Paganism; but with regard to savage races we must speak of the present day. Farnell says: 'I have not been able to find any example of a savage prayer for moral or spiritual blessings' (*Evolution of Religion*, 183). Evidently Chapman considers this true of the natives of Central Africa (W. Chapman, *A Pathfinder in South Central Africa*, 315). Warneck bears the same witness of Indonesians (*Living Forces of the Gospel*, 34, 38, 131). But Brinton declares that 'an ethical element is present in many prayers offered by races which we classify as savage. Thus the Sioux of North America say, "O my grandfather the earth, I ask thee that thou give me a long life and strength of body. When I go to war let me capture many horses and kill many enemies; but in peace let not anger enter my heart."' 'O merciful Lord,' says an Aztec prayer, 'let this chastisement with which thou hast visited us give us freedom from evil and follies' (*The Relig. of Primitive Peoples*, 106). The moral element in these examples is not beyond dispute.

Among the Chinese there is a general belief that Heaven maintains the cause of the righteous and sends calamity on the wicked. But in Confucianism and Taoism there is, so far as I am aware, no thought of spiritual help for man. 'What chiefly strikes us in this Universistic Idolatry,' says J. J. M. de Groot (*Religion in China*, 214–215), 'is its materialistic selfishness. Promotion of the material happiness of the world, in the first place that of the reigning dynasty, is its aim and end. We do not find a trace in it of a higher religious aim.' Buddhism has not availed to alter essentially or permanently the religious aim of the people. The typical prayer is such as this: 'Make me strong in body, and grant me long life. May I have a large family of children that are vigorous and easily brought up. Grant me a good harvest (or success in business). If I go from home, lead

me over every ditch and difficulty.' I have often asked Chinese whether they have ever heard of a heathen who has prayed for spiritual strength or deliverance from temptation. They answer, No. Yet what agonizing struggles men and women have often made to free themselves from the opium habit! And we hear of gamblers who have chopped off their own fingers in the vain hope that their maimed hands might not again be able to grasp playing cards.

As regards ancient India, we are informed that the Aryans prayed for good harvests and great families of splendid children, and for victory in war (Warneck, *Liv. Forces*, 131). Yet in the Vedic hymns are found such prayers as these: 'May we be well-doers before the gods'; 'Give us not up, O Agni, to want of thought'; 'Drive far from us senselessness and anguish: drive far all ill-will from whom thou attendest'; 'Agni, drive away from us sin, which leads us astray' (Farnell, *Evol. of Relig.*, 210–211).

The prayers of modern Hindus are usually for things that perish with the using. Any one, however, who reads that striking book, 'Conversion, Christian and Non-Christian,' by A. C. Underwood, must soon perceive that Indians have again and again attributed great moral change in their lives to the gracious power of some deity. But these converts belong to mediæval and modern times, and no one doubts that Christian influence, direct and indirect, has for ages been at work in the religions of India. The case of Mahayana Buddhism, or Amida Buddhism, is not so clear. In this teaching the idea of Grace, so foreign to Sakya Muni, is sometimes quite conspicuous. But Mahayana Buddhism is supposed to have appeared towards the close of the first century (*c.* A.D. 80?), and the first authentic document is a Chinese translation which was made about the middle, or towards the close, of the second century. It is not safe to assume that Mahayana Buddhism was untouched by the Religion that turns all things upside down.

Among the ancient Greeks and Romans, was there any prayer for spiritual blessing? 'Roman religion,' says Dill, 'was essentially practical. Prayer and vow were the means to obtain temporal blessings. The gods were expected, in return for worship, to be of use to the devotee' (Dill, *Rom. Soc. from Nero to M. Aurel.*, 542). As regards the Roman and his gods, Fowler says: 'The help which he sought from them was not moral help, but material,' and the connexion between religion and morality was 'so loose that many have refused to believe in its existence' (*Relig. Exper. of Rom. Peop.*, 364–5, 466). If further testimony be required, we may quote Farnell, who says: 'The Roman prayers . . . are barren and dull. . . . In fact the spiritual side of the old Roman character has left no trace of itself in any ritual or liturgy of which we have record' (*Evol. of Relig.*, 195.)

As regards the Greeks, somewhat similar sayings might be quoted. 'For the Greeks,' says Wernle, 'religion was almost entirely a matter of ceremonial' (*Begin. of Christianity*, i. 200). 'From several indications,' says Wallace, 'we are almost entitled to assume that . . . religion, strictly so called, was a defective and undeveloped element in Greece' (W. Wallace, *Lect. and Ess. on Nat. Theol. and Ethics*, 196–197). Yet there were men who looked to the gods for some of those benefits which we most associate with worship. An educational official of Cos prayed 'for the health and the virtuous behaviour of the boys.' The State of Corcyra turned to an oracle with the question, 'To what god or what hero shall we pray in order to obtain concord, and to govern our city fairly and well?' A potter of Metapontum prayed that he might 'have a good report among men.' Pindar prayed, 'O God, that bringest all things to pass, grant me the spirit of reverence for noble things'; and again, 'May I walk, O God, in the guileless paths of life, and leave behind me a fair name for my children.' Euripides prayed, 'May the spirit of chastity, the fairest gift of God, abide with me.' And Socrates prayed, 'Grant me to become noble of heart' (for all this see Farnell, *Evol. of Relig.*, 202–204).

Such prayers were seriously meant, as may be inferred from the counsels of the wise men of Greece. Bias of Priene is credited with this advice, 'Despise all those things that you will not need when you are released from the body; but those things that you will then need, discipline yourself to attain, and invoke the gods to help you.' And in the poetical context between Homer and Hesiod, Homer is asked what is the best thing to pray for, and answers, 'That one may be law-abiding in one's soul for ever' (see Farnell, *Hib. Lect.*, 142). At a much later period Epictetus bade men in the conflict for self-government and peace of mind call upon God, as mariners in a storm call on Castor and Pollux (Epict. ii. 18). And Marcus Aurelius not only gave thanks for good teachers, favouring circumstances, and inward guidance, but advised prayer for help in the mastery of evil passions (*Med.* i. 14; ix. 40).

In Egypt, apparently, there was little prayer of a higher character. But on the banks of Euphrates and Tigris, which we associate with luxury and pride and cruel oppression, the evidence of spiritual aspiration has been discovered. In a hymn to the deity called Sin this line occurs, 'Thy word causes truth and righteousness to arise, that men may speak the truth.' The worshipper of Ishtar exclaims, 'Where thou dost regard, the dead live, the sick arise. The unjust become just beholding thy face.' More remarkable are the words in a Prayer for a Favourable Dream: 'From my wickedness cause me to depart, and let me be saved by thee.' Nabonidus, king of Babylon, prays thus, 'The fear of thy great godhead do thou implant in the heart of its people, let them not sin against thy great godhead. . . . As for me, Nabonidus, king of Babylon, save me from sinning against thy great godhead. . . . And as for Belshazzar, the first-born son . . . do thou implant in his heart the fear of thy great divinity. Let him not turn unto sinning. Let him be satisfied with fulness of life' (Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the O.T.*, 145, 156, 185, 379). 'O Marduk,' cries a ruler of Babylon, '. . . let me behold thy godhead. . . . Set righteousness on my lips and grace in my heart.' Even Nebuchadnezzar prays, 'Lead the king by the right way. . . . I am . . . the work of thy hand. . . . Grant me what thou deemest best.' Lastly, Nabonidus prays, 'Let me not in my pride lose knowledge of thee' (see Farnell, *Evol. of Relig.*, 220–221).

To give a complete account of the spiritual aspirations of Paganism is far beyond my powers and opportunities. The subject is not much considered. It is possible, for example, to read a volume upon ancient Egyptian religion, without finding any answer to the question, Did the inhabitants of the Nile valley expect anything from their gods beyond health and wealth and prosperity? Even missionaries sometimes spend a lifetime in a heathen land without learning anything of the prayers of the people. This may appear surprising. But perhaps it is equally surprising that ordinary students of the Old Testament, and sometimes even those who are most versed in Old Testament Theology, pay no great attention to the question, What did the Hebrew saints expect from God?

The ordinary reader of the Old Testament is familiar with its marvellous expressions of God's love for His people, and with their expressions of love and longing for Him, their frequent acknowledgments of sin and prayers for pardon. Usually, perhaps, the reader takes for granted in the old saints a strong sense of spiritual dependence, and never doubts that they uttered many a cry for spiritual succour. When, however, he makes a resolute attempt to read the Book of Psalms with open eyes, he finds that they abound in situations of distress, in pleas for help against foes, and redemption from sickness, in utterances of fear passing into trust, triumph, and gratitude: then he discovers, with a start, that many of those songs which seemed to be spiritual, are telling of 'salvation' on a lower plane. He wishes that there had been a greater number of prayers like those of the 119th and the 51st Psalms, and that the writers had been less taken up with the malice of foes without, and more conscious of their need for a shield and helper against the foes within.

Yet it would be a mistake to assert that in the Old Testament God was represented as giving a 'law' or 'instruction,' on the assumption that for obedience Israel's own powers sufficed. The question of moral ability or inability had not distinctly arisen. It was easier for religious minds to apprehend the need for a gift of physical salvation, or even of supernatural strength of body, as in Samson's case, or, again, of skill, as in the case of artificers, or of warriors, who rejoiced in the words, 'He teacheth my hands to war' (Ps 18^{34}). It was perceived that God bestowed a higher kind of wisdom on some, as on Solomon. And when the Spirit of the Lord came upon the prophets, their wisdom and discernment were well-nigh a spiritual gift for themselves, and even for their hearers. We have an example in Micah when he says, 'But I truly am full of power [by the Spirit of the Lord] to declare unto Jacob his transgression' (Mic 3^{8}; cf. Is 50^{4}).

Occasionally there is presented the pathetic spectacle of God standing by, and longing for a heart of righteousness in His people. 'Oh that there were such an heart in them,' He exclaims, 'that they would fear me, and keep all my commandments always' (Dt 5^{29}); 'Oh that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments! then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea' (Is 48^{18}); 'Oh that my people would hearken unto me, that Israel would walk in my ways!' (Ps 81^{13}).

Why did God stand by? If He made stubborn the heart of kings, and even deceived the heart of prophets, when it served His purpose, why did He not bestow upon His chosen a heart to obey? The prophetic writers began to muse upon this question. 'The Lord,' says Deuteronomy, 'hath not given you an heart to know, and eyes to see,

and ears to hear, unto this day' (Dt 29[4]). But when the blessing and the curse come upon thee, he goes on to say, and thou callest them to mind in all the countries to which the Lord drives thee, and shalt return to the Lord; then He will turn thy captivity, 'and the Lord will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart' (Dt 30[1-6]).

It is true that the prophets exhort their folk to purify themselves. 'Wash you, make you clean,' is the command of the Lord on Isaiah's lips (Is 1[16]; cf. Ps 26[6] 73[13]). 'O Jerusalem, wash thine heart from wickedness,' cries Jeremiah; and in the same chapter the people are enjoined to circumcise their own hearts (Jer 4[14. 4]). Ezekiel, surrounded by men who thought themselves hopelessly entangled in the meshes of their parents' sins, and their own, makes so bold as to put into God's mouth these words, 'Make you a new heart, and a new spirit' (Ezk 18[31]). Notwithstanding this, Isaiah was aware that nothing but the coal from God's altar could cleanse his lips and make them fit for service. And Jeremiah promises that God will give the good captives a heart to know Him (Jer 24[7]). Yet more, Jeremiah, or his editors, it matters not which, spoke of a new covenant and a law written in the heart (Jer 31[31]). And again, we hear the delightful promise, 'I will give them one heart and one way . . . and I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me' (Jer 32[39. 40]).

What wonderful news God imparted to Ezekiel! 'I will give them one heart,' says he, in God's name, 'and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh' (Ezk 11[19]). The prophet perceived that through transgressions and the chastisements which followed, God's people had brought disgrace on their land and his, for the onlookers derided it as a devourer of men; and that they had brought reproach upon God Himself as a God who could neither guard nor save. The prophet saw that when, for their idolatry and bloodshed, God had driven them forth, the mere Return of such a people could be no Restoration; it must issue in fresh defilement, with the familiar sequel of judgment, Gentile scorn, and desecration of the Holy Name. The Lord must do a new thing: He must make His people holy, and fit to abide in His holy land. 'From all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, . . . and I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes'; this is the gift of God (Ezk 36[25-27]).

Lastly, the Book of Zechariah speaks of a spirit of grace and supplication poured upon the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, yes, and a fountain opened for sin and for uncleanness (Zec 12[10] 13[1]).

Having such great and precious promises, the ancient Jews were emboldened to ask not for pardon only, but for deliverance from wickedness, and even for guidance and upholding on the way of righteousness. Among prayers for higher things the most frequent are such as ask for teaching and leading. A few of these may signify a desire for direction in common business and success in it; but when the psalmists say, 'Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law' (Ps 119[18]); or, 'Teach me thy way, O Lord; I will walk in thy truth' (Ps 86[11]); or, 'Teach me to do thy will, for thou art my God' (Ps 143[10]); or, 'Lead me in the way everlasting' (Ps 139[24]),—we recognize that such petitioners have learned to covet the best gifts.

We may remark that here and there in the Old Testament there are passages that speak of affliction as correcting and leading to God (*e.g.* Job 5[17] 33[19ff.], Am 4[4-13], Is 26[9], Ps 119[67. 71], also Ec 18[13]).

Among prayers that appear to utter more directly the desire for deliverance from sin and for holiness of life, there are some passages that may mean either pardon or purification, or both, such as, 'Take away all iniquity' (Hos 14[2-4]); 'He will tread our iniquities under foot; and thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea' (Mic 7[19]); 'As for our transgressions, thou shalt purge them away' (Ps 65[3]); 'He shall redeem Israel from all his iniquities' (Ps 130[8]). 'As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us' (Ps 103[12]).

Other passages speak without ambiguity of the desire for deliverance and holiness. 'Turn thou us unto thee, O Lord, and we shall be turned,' cries the Book of Lamentations (La 5[21]). Agur desires to be kept from vanity and lies (Pr 30[8]; cf. Ps 119[29]). The psalmists pray, 'Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth; keep the door of my lips. Incline not my heart to any evil thing' (Ps 141[3. 4]); 'O that my ways were established to observe thy statutes. . . . O let me not wander from thy commandments. . . . Make me to go in the path of thy commandments. . . . Turn away mine eyes from beholding vanity, and quicken me in thy ways. . . . Order my footsteps in thy word, and let not any iniquity have dominion over me' (Ps 119[5. 10. 35. 37. 133]). Another psalmist who loves the law beseeches God to clear him from secret

faults (Ps 19^{12}). And another, who delights to do God's will, and has God's law in his heart, pleads for an immediate rescue from his iniquities (Ps $40^{12.\ 13}$).

It was given to one prophet only to make in so many words the promise of a new heart and a new spirit, and it was given to one saint only to ask for a clean heart and a right spirit. Where can any writing be found to set beside the fifty-first Psalm?

Some of the psalmists appear independent and self-satisfied in their goodness. Perhaps, like Paul, they could honestly boast that, as touching the righteousness which was in the Law, they were found blameless. Did they, or did they not, pray for strength? Was prayer of that kind common? We have been forced to make much of Ps 119 just because petitions of the kind which we have cited are very rare in the Old Testament.

Self-satisfaction and a feeling of dependence on God may be found side by side. Nehemiah, who was quick to claim the acknowledgment of his good deeds, was, like Jeremiah, much given to prayer (see J. E. McFadyen, *The Prayers of the Bible*, 50); and he tells how he sought higher guidance in sudden difficulty, and how God put it into his heart to do great things for Jerusalem (Neh $2^{4.\ 12}$; cf. 7^{5} 9^{20}). It is to be observed that the later books of the Bible, such as Chronicles, are fond of prayer, and are not behind the earlier books in their acknowledgment of Divine influence upon the hearts of men (see 1 Ch $29^{18.\ 19}$, 2 Ch 30^{12}, Ezr 1^{5} 6^{22}, Hag 1^{14}, Dn 9^{13}).

As direct prayers for deliverance from moral evil and for the supply of spiritual power are very few, it is the more needful to remember that the longing for God and the joy in Him which find utterance again and again, may well imply far more than any tongue could tell.

In the Old Testament generally, confessions of sin and entreaties for pardon are abundant and full of urgency. Yet they are so intermixed with the sighs and groans of sickness and distress that Christians are not quite able to enter into the heart and mind of the suppliants. As for the feeling of helplessness in the struggle against pride, passion, and worldliness, and in the endeavour after a godly life, it is far less common and less frankly confessed than Christians would have anticipated. When, however, the passages relevant to this subject are gathered together, and then compared with similar fruits of the Pagan spirit, we cannot fail to be astonished at the wealth of revelation among the people of God.

Recent Foreign Theology.

German Theology.

At a congress of Orientalists, Wutz raised a question of great importance for textual criticism by defending the thesis that the text from which the LXX was translated was not the Hebrew consonantal text but a Greek transcription of it. Professor Fischer has examined the argument very carefully,[1] and reaches the conclusion that, though the theory is remotely possible in its application to Kings and Chronicles, it is certainly not true of the Pentateuch. For example, Ex 4^{31} the ἐχάρη which translates וישמעו does not necessarily point to an original οὐεσμαον, but is more reasonably explained as simply due to a mishearing (וישמחו) of the Hebrew. The first part of this important brochure is occupied with a discussion of the nature of the Hebrew consonantal text presupposed by the LXX. Some of the conclusions are that the *matres lectionis* were, with a few exceptions, regularly written at the end of a word, but less frequently in the middle than in our Hebrew Bibles, that the 3 s.m. suffix was perhaps more frequently written with ה than in M.T., and that there was no separation between words or sentences and no final letters. ὑψηλήν is twice written as ὑψελην on p. 5 and once on p. 8, and on p. 23 unserzogen should be unterzogen. As all the relevant passages in the Pentateuch are here collected, this discussion is of peculiar value and interest to students of the text.

[1] In *Zur Septuaginta-Vorlage im Pentateuch* (Töpelmann, Giessen Mk.2.30).

Hans Duhm, son of the better known Bernhard Duhm, has made an elaborate study of 'The Communion of God with Men in the Old Testa-

ment.'[1] It is a purely historical study, for Duhm rightly believes that the flavour of Old Testament religion is dissipated when it is forced into the categories of systematic theology. So he begins by describing that communion as it was understood in the very early period, with its local and other implications, and traces it through the prophetic and legal period up to the period of Ecclesiastes with its scepticism, and Daniel with its belief in the resurrection. The communion of the prophets with God and their polemic against the popular cultic religion are delineated with much sympathy. Duhm concludes his objective discussion by a confession of his own personal faith, that the prophets were, as they claimed to be, in direct communion with, and inspired and commissioned by, God Himself for their unique task as interpreters of His will.

It is pathetic that Professor Karl Marti did not live to see the volume of Old Testament essays[2] by old pupils and friends which Professor Budde, the editor, had planned to present him on his seventieth birthday, which turned out to be also the day of his burial. These essays are by Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, Swiss, French, British, and American as well as German scholars, and they embrace an extraordinary variety of subjects—text, metre, grammar, sources, studies of special themes like the Sabbath, the Servant of Jahweh, and the meaning of the number 7, or special passages like Gn 11^{1-9}, Is 21^{1-10}, Ps 16, 22, 130. There is something to suit every taste, historical, philological, theological—a discussion on Κύριος (with and without the article) in the LXX, of the original form of the story of Job, of Alexander the Great in Old Testament prophecy, whom Torrey finds not only in Hab., but in Ezk 26, Joel, Zec 9, Is 23 and 14^{16-21}. Where all is so full of interest and stimulus it would be invidious to select. Students of textual criticism will be specially interested in Köhler's essay on emendations and Torczyner's on obscure Bible-passages: in the latter occurs an interesting suggestion to transfer בראש in Am 2^{7} to the following clause, 'who trample the poor in the dust of the ground, and lay prostrate the humble *at the head* of the way.' The essays are nearly all short, from four to ten pages, and they are all readable and stimulating to an unusual degree. In the range and variety of their subjects and in the number of the countries represented by their contributors, they offer eloquent evidence of the fascination of Old Testament study, and of the far-spread influence of the great scholar, whose memory—apart from the appended bibliography of his writings—will long be preserved in this noble tribute.

[1] *Der Verkehr Gottes mit den Menschen im Alten Testament* (Mohr, Tübingen; M.8.40).

[2] *Karl Marti, zum siebzigsten Geburtstage gewidmet* (Töpelmann, Giessen; M.16).

Baudissin died in February of this year at the age of seventy-eight, and a week after his burial a glowing tribute was paid him by Sellin,[3] who in a memorial speech sketched with a master-hand Baudissin's contribution to Old Testament science. He especially singles out his 'Studies in the History of Semitic Religion' (1876–78), 'History of the Old Testament Priesthood' (1889), 'Introduction to the Old Testament' (1901), and 'Adonis and Esmun' (1911); and a posthumous work is to follow on 'Kyrios as Divine Name in Judaism and its Place in the History of Religion.' Baudissin was relatively conservative, believing in the priority of P to Dt., and perhaps there is no scholar whose native sympathies enable him to appraise Baudissin's work more justly than Sellin. He points out that all his work is marked by two features—thorough grounding in Semitic philology, and interest in the history of Semitic religion, which gave his Old Testament Studies their large background.

Attention was called in the July issue to the first volume of Holtzmann's new translation and exposition of the New Testament. The second volume[4] is marked by the same power to make the results of scholarship interesting and to present them in popular and attractive style. This volume includes Ac., 1 and 2 Th., Gal., 1 and 2 Co., Ro., Ph., Philem., Col., Eph. The discussion never wanders into extraneous matters, it is always strictly *ad rem*: all Holtzmann says, for example, about Paul's thorn in the flesh (2 Co 12^{8}) is that it was some painful illness whose nature cannot be conjectured from the few hints given—from

[3] *Wolf Wilhelm Graf v. Baudissin, Gedächtnisrede*, von Ernst Sellin (Töpelmann, Giessen; Pf.80).

[4] *Das Neue Testament, übersetzt und erklärt*, von Oskar Holtzmann, ii. Teil (Töpelmann, Giessen; Mk.9.50).

Gal 4^{15} we may infer some eye-trouble. There is no allusion in 1 Co 13^{3} (to be *burned*) to the alternative reading καυχήσωμαι, and even the famous Ac 15, including translation and comment, is disposed of in five pages. A work like this by a scholar who knows how to write and to confine himself to essentials is a great boon to the educated public who are interested in the origins of the Christian faith.

Professor Causse's book [1] is one of many proofs that the criticism of the Psalter is passing, or rather has already passed, into a new stage. He recognizes that the psalms are largely cult hymns, that many, and especially the 'royal' psalms, must be pre-exilic, that there are even pre-Davidic elements in the Psalter, and that even for the Davidic period the Chronicler's 'singers' are not necessarily an anachronism. He discusses the nature of the early poetry, its lyrical power, its mastery of form, its attitude to Nature, and points out that from indications of a later date we should often rather infer redaction than origin. Causse would carry the Blessing of Jacob or Moses back 'probably' to the twelfth century. He translates, with useful comments, the song of Deborah, the oracles of Balaam, the elegy of David, etc., and he deals similarly with the psalms discussed—the royal psalms, for example, 45, 20, 2, 110, 72. The prophetic oracles which appear in some psalms (cf. 21, 60) suggest that the relation of the prophet to the cult was more intimate than till lately it was the fashion to suppose. There are interesting discussions of the social nature of ancient music and on the influence of the monarchy in the development of Hebrew music. Causse is indebted to Mowinckel, but he preserves his independence. Of the four conceivably Maccabæan psalms on p. 108, lxxxiv. should be lxxxiii.

In some *Notes de lexicographie Hébraïque*,[2] reprinted from *Biblica*, Professor Paul Joüon offers interesting comments on certain Old Testament words, which he substantiates by careful discussion. The existence of a Qal of אנק for example, he thinks is very doubtful, only the Niph. being certainly attested. Again, חִבֵּשׁ he regards not as a Pu. but as a passive of the Qal. The root חשל, should probably be removed from the dictionary and נחשלים of Dt 25^{18} read as נְכִשָּׁלִים. Again, אִישׁ seems sometimes to have the nuance of 'important man,' and אִשָּׁה, 'lady,' cf. Pr 9^{13}, *Dame* Folly: this might throw some light on the γύναι of the New Testament; cf. Jn 2^{4} 19^{26}. These and Joüon's other suggestions are well worthy of consideration.

In a popular lecture [3] Professor W. Eichrodt of Basel ably defends the thesis that the religion of the Old Testament is a religion of revelation: God acting through history and on human personalities reveals Himself as a redeeming God. And this conception of God goes back not only to Moses but beyond him, as is evidenced by the patriarchal stories. This point leads Eichrodt into a friendly criticism of Söderblom. He further maintains that the ethico-religious attainments of the pre-prophetic period have been unduly depreciated; without them the prophets themselves would be unintelligible. There is a useful comparison of the Decalogue, and especially the Book of the Covenant, with the Code of Hammurabi, which emphasizes the worthier spirit that inspires the former. More than any other people does Israel understand the meaning of sin and of conscience, the unity of mankind, the Divine control of history and its goal in a community in fellowship with God. The whole discussion is pervaded by a warm religious spirit.

J. E. McFadyen.

Glasgow.

The house of Töpelmann, Giessen, is at present engaged in publishing several series of theological books, some of them, it is true, merely of pamphlet size. In *Das christologische Problem als Lebensfrage*,[4] Licentiate Peter deals with the question of the great gulf between God and man as linked with the conviction of their underlying unity. This he regards as the central problem of human life. He weighs the theories that solve the problem by minimizing the difference, or by exalting man to the Divine level, and will countenance those only that look to find the reconciliation in an act of God. The solution he wins at length is that of a

[1] *Les Plus Vieux Chants de la Bible*, par A. Causse (Librairie Félix Alcan, Paris; 15 fr.).

[2] Institut Biblique Pontifical, Rome.

[3] *Ist die alt-israelitische Nationalreligion Offenbarungsreligion?* (Bertelsmann, Güttersloh; Mk.1).

[4] Von Heinrich Peter, Pfarrer in Bad Ems ('Vorträge der theol. Konferenz zu Giessen'); M.1.10.

tragic synthesis—life through death, the Cross and the Resurrection, or, as we might put it, 'Man's extremity, God's opportunity'—a truth to be held, or rather lived, in Faith alone.

Another series is represented by *Vom Werden der neuen Gemeinde*.[1] In this Pastor Heitmann disclaims any intention of setting up another Church, or even a new organization subsidiary to the present Church. The 'new Church' is meanwhile but a hope and an ideal, born in the hearts of some amid the ruin and anguish of the time. Features of the rising aspiration are a sense of corporate guilt, a complete and silent surrender to God's Word, and a deepened realization of the sacraments as expressing the objective fact of God's work with men. These two booklets are charged with suggestive thinking, and few who read them will escape the impression of being in touch with earnest and devout minds.

From Töpelmann comes also vol. v. of a new series of theological manuals, namely, *Konfessionskunde*,[2] though only the first half. That title is preferred to 'Symbolik,' because the author's purpose is to set forth not so much the traditional or accepted creeds, but rather all that the several Churches stand for. The first half, after an introduction treating of the older confessions, covers Eastern Christendom and a small section of Roman Catholicism, leaving what remains in the case of the latter Church, together with the Anglican Communion and Protestantism, to be dealt with in the second half. For us perhaps the portion still to come will be of most interest, but it should be noted that, so far, the work is finely written, very thorough, and replete with significant facts; and if the rest continues in the same manner, the completed volume will give us a valuable delineation of the inward and outward life of the various communities of Christendom.

Still another series—a string of lectures and essays in the province of philosophy and history. In No. 9 of this group Dr. W. Schulze-Soelde expounds Aristotle on mind and matter.[3] As usual, the starting-point is Aristotle's criticism of the Platonic Ideas; then we have his attempts to assign the proper place and function to the famous entities, the *hyle*, the *eidos*, the *nous*, Nature and God—the whole movement between formless matter and the Deity, who, merely in thinking Himself, objectifies the world, without creating it. This little work is a piece of concise and careful exposition, and will be found interesting by those who have already wrestled with the confused and intricate material of the *Metaphysics*; may it also serve as leading-strings to those who have not!

Frederick the Great was no bigot in religious things; witness his intimacy—for a time—with Voltaire. Probably, however, it was less from a broad-minded religious motive than from a purely commercial one that he encouraged the founding of a Greek-Orthodox congregation in Breslau. Desiring to attract traders from the countries lying to the East, he would introduce a friendly and home-like element into their foreign environment. The story of the little colony,[4] its ups and downs from its brave beginnings in the middle of the eighteenth century until its rather pathetic break-up some forty years later, is told by Professor Hoffmann in a most sympathetic spirit and with much interesting detail.

ALEXANDER GRIEVE.

Glasgow.

[1] Von Ludwig Heitmann, Pastor in Hamburg ('Aus der Welt der Religion'); 80 Pfge.

[2] Von Hermann Mulert, Professor in Giessen ('Sammlung Töpelmann: Theologie in Abriss'); M.3.50.

[3] *Metaphysik und Erkenntnis bei Aristoteles*, von W. Schulze-Soelde, Privatdozen in Greifswald ('Philosophie und Geschichte') (Tübingen: Möhr; M.1.20).

[4] *Die griechisch-katholische Gemeinde in Breslau unter Friedrich d. Gr.*, von D. Georg Hoffmann, Professor in Breslau (Breslau: Korn; M.3.50).

Contributions and Comments.

Luke xvii. 21.

SOME months ago, in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES a paragraph was quoted from Dr. Ballard's *Reality in Bible Reading*, which asserts that 'the Kingdom of God is within you' is the correct rendering in Lk 17^{21}.

One almost despairs of driving out certain heresies (*e.g.* 'Magdalene' from Lk 7). All one can do is to maintain patience in assertion. As here:

1. The context makes Jesus say that the Kingdom is *not* 'here': therefore 'in the midst of you' *cannot* be the meaning in this place.

2. ἐντὸς ὑμῶν never has this meaning: 'no *sound* example has yet been adduced of ἐντός so used,' says Field.

It is a pity that the Revisers relegated the mistake to the margin: it should be in the limbo of forgotten things.

F. Warburton Lewis.

Bolton.

Cross-Bearing.

Mr. J. D. Bryan's ingenious theory (September 1926, p. 551 f.) that 'to bear his cross' means 'to pull up his tent-pegs' surely breaks down over Simon of Cyrene, where Luke uses φέρειν ('to carry') to translate Mark's αἴρειν ('to lift').

Also Lk 14^{27} and Mt 10^{38} are probably the same scrap of tradition differently grouped by two Evangelists. If so, Luke translates λαμβάνει ('takes') by βαστάζει ('bears as a burden'). The point lies not in the weight or in any sense of criminality, but rather in what the Apostle calls the ἀπόκριμα τοῦ θανάτου (2 Co 1^{9}), the decision to be ready to die for the King and His Kingdom.

D. Matheson.

Peaslake, Surrey.

John vi. 29–31.

'What sign shewest thou then . . . ?'

The point to note in this conversation is that these inquirers, who were obviously in earnest, and anxious to find in Jesus a leader, while they accepted the feeding of the five thousand as good enough proof of His fitness to be their king (6^{15}), did not think it sufficient to support His claim to personal devotion as a spiritual leader whom God had sent (v.^{29}). Evidently the feeding of the five thousand did not appear to them to be a miracle. Their desire to make Him king after it might be held to show that they considered it a triumph of organization. At any rate, in whatever way they understood the incident, they reminded Jesus that it could scarcely support His claim to supplant Moses as their spiritual leader, for Moses had done a more wonderful thing, he had provided a miraculous supply of food from heaven itself. Jesus replies, not by claiming that the feeding was a miracle, but by criticising their traditional interpretation of the story of the manna. Not for the first or last time He assumes the rôle of higher critic. No matter how we may interpret the Greek of Jesus' reply in v.^{32}, it is undoubtedly a contradiction of their interpretation of the verse they had quoted. It is not to the point to argue that His meaning was that it was God, not Moses, who performed the miracle. His meaning was, 'Moses did no miracle; he merely showed you where to get the food God had provided. I claim to have done no miracle either. You were hungry and thought there was not enough to go round; I showed you that, properly distributed, there was enough to go round. I did it because you were hungry; I did it also as a sign to teach you that your spiritual hunger can be satisfied in the same way. For you are spiritually hungry; Moses' food no longer goes round. But God's supply is still ample, and if you will trust Me, I will distribute to you all this spiritual food, which is simply the truth about life, without which a man does not live, and of which the Father has made Me the storehouse.'

R. E. Lee.

Nowshera, India.

Beth-Horon (Jos. x. 11).

A reference to the Bible Dictionaries and Encyclopædias shows the word to be generally derived from חרר, *to bore a hole*, and is rendered 'House (or Place) of the *Hollow* (or *Hole* or *Caves*).' It is difficult, however, to see why just that particular spot should have been selected to bear the name of 'Hollow,' since the whole southern country, from the Desert of the Wandering to Hebron consists of a series of rolling dome-shaped hills and downs, with short and rounded valleys, gentle ascents, long ridges, and small plateaux.

The present writer would suggest the derivation from חרר, *to burn* (see *B.D.B.*, חרר, II.). The place was so called not on account of its shape or its connexion with hollows, but because it was once a 'burning' mountain, an active volcano. Interesting support for this theory is found in *Palestine and the Adjacent Countries*, by I. S. Horowitz, where we read: 'It may be conjectured that a great earthquake accompanied the hailstorm, for this earthquake survived in the memory of the nation nine hundred years afterwards, and is mentioned by the prophet Isaiah (Is 28^{21} 30^{30}).' As H. B. Tristram says (*The Natural History of the Bible*, p. 15), 'Geologic phenomena . . . must have been more or less familiar to the writers of the Holy Scripture. Among these are the references to earthquakes, and to volcanoes, as though "burning mountains" were a then existent phenomenon' (cf. Ps 104^{32} 144^{5}).

Judah J. Slotki.

Manchester.

The Transfiguration.

The Transfiguration was the sequel to the conversation about Messiah that took place between our Lord and His disciples near Cæsarea Philippi. It was the symbolic vision of that conversation. So much is clear. It is not so clear to whom this spiritual experience actually came, whether to Jesus or to some of the disciples, or to one of them or to all. From the Lukan account of the scene it is possible to disentangle two versions. One of these, the Marcan account, according to the usual tradition, can be attributed to St. Peter. The other runs as follows (Lk $9^{28ff.}$):

> 'It came to pass about eight days after these sayings . . . he went *up into* the *mountain* to pray. And as he was praying his form was altered *and his* raiment dazzling. Two men . . . who appeared in glory and spake of his decease which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem. Now Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep; but having kept awake (perhaps tr. 'on waking') they saw his glory and the two men that stood with them. And it came to pass as they were parting from him . . . as they entered into the cloud . . . and when the voice came *Jesus* was found alone. And they held their peace and told no man in those days any of the things which they had seen.'

No doubt this account included as well some of the matter of the Marcan version. But two points are important: (i) that St. Peter alone is named, and (ii) that the experience came to one or more disciples awaking out of sleep. May we infer, therefore, that the vital experience was St. Peter's alone? The material for the construction of it was vividly impressed on his mind. The confession near Cæsarea had led our Lord to explain Messiahship in terms of defeat. It was to St. Peter that the rebuke was given—'Get thee behind me, Satan.' That sentence itself suggests that this was the occasion when our Lord told His followers of His early temptation and of the voice of consecration he had heard at the Baptism. The Baptism would lead to the identification of the Baptist with Elijah. Cf. Mt 17^{13}. Dt 18^{15} brought Messiah into association with Moses. The association goes back to the earliest days of the Church, if the apocryphal tradition which gives it to our Lord Himself is unsound. With this one exception, the significant features of the Transfiguration scene were present to St. Peter's mind in a way more direct and touching than to any other of the Twelve. The record of his character reveals him, it is true, as pedestrian in imagination. It also reveals him as a mystic and a seer of visions. The independent matter of Luke and the early chapters of Acts give a coherent picture of this side of St. Peter which the Marcan tradition is inclined to neglect. If at times Peter approached the grotesque, he was also capable of the loftiest reach. With his powers quickened by that period of deepest insight into the Master's mind, he went into the quiet of the mountain and translated what he had heard into that glowing experience.

The Marcan account of the Transfiguration represents St. Peter's own self-depreciation. He shrinks from allowing himself to be a principal. He emphasizes his own prosaic appeal for three tents. A profound spiritual adventure is made to look impersonal, primarily to turn attention away from the man to the Master. In that process for our day much of its touching reality is lost. If this interprets the facts, then the Transfiguration is a spiritual revelation to St. Peter of his own confession at Cæsarea, and he saw on the holy mount what St. Paul was to see on the Damascus road.

E. J. Martin.

Rastrick.

Entre Nous.

Living upon a Slope.

Dr. Hutton's literary output is amazing. His publishers announce just now four new books by him—'The Dark Mile,' 'The Tragedy of Saul,' 'Guidance from Francis Thompson in Matters of Faith,' and 'A Golden Book of Francis Thompson.' The one in our hand is *The Dark Mile* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). There are some thirty short essays in it in Dr. Hutton's characteristic style. Many of them centre round a phrase with which he 'deliberately torments himself,' until there opens out a totally unexpected richness of thought in it. In the second essay he takes Mrs. Meynell's opening words in 'Christ in the Universe':

> With this ambiguous earth
> His dealings have been told us,

and lets his imagination play on the three words, 'this ambiguous earth.' I think, he says, that this word 'ambiguous' is 'a profounder and more

subtle word than Wordsworth's "unintelligible." It is also a more stirring word. "Unintelligible"—if that is the last word, why, then it is the last word. But "ambiguous"!—if that be the worst that can be said of life, and it is in fact and in logic the very worst—that life presents a scene where there is indeed much evil, but where also there is much good; a place where indeed the sun sets, but a place likewise where the sun rises; a place of tears, but a place also of a wonderful laughter; if that is all—why, what are we here for but to augment the force and volume of the finer things, to fling ourselves on the side of the desirable thing lest it should sink in the scale?

In fact, *we are here to vote*; and whatever our vote may mean for the world and for the future, *for us one by one, our vote is the casting vote.*'

Turning over the volume we come upon another phrase full of meaning—'living upon a slope.' In this phrase, he says, everything that is of consequence in the hypothesis of evolution, in so far as it bears upon us as moral and responsible beings, is contained. Man is on the sloping stairs of life 'urged upward from within, and, despite at times his chafed hands and bleeding knees, confident of his destiny, for he has a hold upon that rope let down from heaven, which God is drawing to Himself!' What is the rope? It is faith in Jesus Christ. And what is important is not, Where did the sloping process begin, but where, by the favour of God, may it not end? 'To build a wretched doctrine of man's nature, to deny God and an ascending moral career to man, simply because his body bears evidence of lowly relationships, is no more just, than it would be to estimate the full nature of man by considering exclusively his meanest physical functions. Man does more than eat and sleep: he thinks, he wills, he loves; he can give up his life for an idea: he can kneel in prayer and rise from his knees to endure, if need be, some intolerable pain. Man lives upon a slope: but it depends how your own face is turned, whether you say it is a slope up, or a slope down.' And the important point to remember is that 'God judges us, not according to our position on the slope—for it may be that one begins higher than another. God judges us according to the position we have attained compared with the position we set out from.'

Individualism and Co-operation.

A number of lectures were delivered lately to the Aberdeen Branch of the Workers' Educational Association. They have now been published with the title *Ways of Living* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). There was one inquiry underlying these lectures—whether a study of the diverse ways of living amongst plants and animals can have any suggestion for man? The parasitic type of life among animals is dealt with by Dr. John Rennie. Here food and shelter are gained with the minimum of effort, and nothing good can be said about it.

The two other modes of living among animals are the individualistic and the social. These are treated by Professor J. Arthur Thomson. They are the two chief ways of reacting in the struggle for existence. The first is to intensify individual effort, to tighten the belt and to set the teeth. This is the way of the eagle and the lion. The other way is to produce mutual aid and to subordinate self. That is the way of the rook and the beaver. Professor Thomson comes to two conclusions about these contrasted modes of living. In the first place, it is wrong to look upon the individualistic as selfish and the co-operative as altruistic, for the individualistic otter is just as true a mother as the co-operative beaver, the golden eagles in their lonely retreat are as devoted parents as the gregarious rooks. The contrast between the two modes of living is not an ethical but a social one.

The second conclusion is that both these modes of living are successful—and both have their disadvantages. 'The advantages of the "each for himself" mode of life are that it fosters all-roundness of development and sturdy vigour. The disadvantages are that the struggle for existence may be intensified to the unendurable uttermost—which spells extinction—that the mastery of the environment is more limited, and that there are fewer opportunities for cultivating the integrative kin-sympathies which flourish in a social *milieu*. On the other hand, the co-operative, gregarious, social mode of life, which certainly makes for stability, achievement, social sentiment, and sometimes external heritage, as in the ant-hill and the beaver-village, is apt to over-subordinate the individual and to throw a shield over variations that were sometimes better dead. It is an extraordinary fact that some ant-species, that can neither collect food nor eat it of themselves, are kept alive by their slaves! Which things are a parable.'

What can Man learn then from Animate Nature? Professor Thomson does not work this out, but the suggestion would seem to be that at some times and in some places he should take the individualistic

animal as his pattern, and at other times and in other places the social. 'The study of animal societary forms is still young, but it cannot fail to be of suggestive value to students of mankind. This value will be increased, not decreased, if man's apartness is appreciated as well as his solidarity. For a human society stands high above the integrates we study among the beasts of the field. Man has language, rising above words; he has reason, or the capacity for conceptual inference, rising above intelligence; he has a more or less clear consciousness of his own history; he has the power, if he would oftener exercise it, of guiding his conduct in reference to ideals; and he has apparently unlimited possibilities of ameliorating his social heritage. Why does he not rise more quickly beyond the adumbrations seen in herd and hive?'

Contemplation.

If, being no student of Hinduism yourself, you wish to read a very attractive and clearly expressed but simple statement of the contribution that Hinduism may make to Christianity and the way in which Christ can bring Hindu ideals to completeness, you should turn to *The Indian Mystic*, by Mr. J. C. Winslow, M.A. (S.C.M.; 1s. 6d. net). Put shortly, there are three things which Mr. Winslow says the children of India can teach the West—an intense personal devotion to our Lord; an enthusiasm for renunciation; and the value of the contemplative life. On the last point he says: 'We English Christians, with our stress on the "practical" expression of the Christian life, tend to leave so little room for prayer that we hardly know how to spend half an hour in silence, alone with God.' And then he gives the following incident. 'But I remember on one occasion in India taking some Indian boys with me for a month in the country during the school holidays. We had arranged to begin each day with an hour set apart for meditation, but after the first two or three days some of them came to me and asked that the time might be extended, as they found it impossible to complete their meditation within the hour. These were Christians of quite humble origin and simple education. What may we expect, then, from those with a hereditary tradition of religious training like the Brahmans?'

Sadhu Sundar Singh.

In a small book—containing in fact less than a hundred pages—Messrs. Macmillan have published a brief description of the spiritual life, its different states of existence, and the destiny of good and evil men as seen in visions by Sadhu Sundar Singh. The title is *Visions of the Spiritual World* (2s. 6d. net). In his Preface the Sadhu says: 'In this book I have attempted to write of some of the visions which God has given me. . . . At Kotgarh, fourteen years ago, while I was praying, my eyes were opened to the Heavenly Vision. So vividly did I see it all that I thought I must have died, and that my soul had passed into the glory of heaven; but throughout the intervening years these visions have continued to enrich my life. I cannot call them up at will, but, usually when I am praying or meditating, sometimes as often as eight or ten times in a month, my spiritual eyes are opened to see within the heavens, and, for an hour or two, I walk in the glory of the heavenly sphere with Christ Jesus, and hold converse with angels and spirits.' But it is only some of the visions that are recorded here, for the Sadhu says later that the angels conversed with him about many other matters, but it is impossible to record them because there is no language in which the meaning of these deep spiritual truths could be expressed, and also because the angels do not wish these visions recorded.

The question which occurs to us is, What is the nature of the Sadhu's visions? And that is the question which occurred also to the Bishop of Lahore, who has written the Foreword. The Sadhu Sundar Singh is his friend, and he has read and carefully weighed these visions. This is what he says, and we cannot do better than accept it: '"There be some here that shall not taste of death till they have seen the Kingdom of God come with power." In both S. Mark's and S. Matthew's Gospels these words are so closely linked on to the story of the Transfiguration that I cannot doubt that they interpreted this memorable event in the life of the three chosen Disciples (one of whom was, as it were, the sponsor of S. Mark's Gospel) as a coming of the Kingdom with power. It consisted in the lifting of the veil which shrouds the unseen world, so that the denizens of that world were visible and audible to human eyes and ears, and in the glory of the real Jesus shining through the veil of flesh.

'May it not be that this kind of experience is still given sometimes to God's servants? I personally believe that the Sadhu's experiences recounted in these "Visions" were something of this kind: that for him, as for these other servants of God, the veil which shrouds the real was lifted, so that he saw our Lord as He really is, and that world.

'Messages that come as the result of such experiences must be reverenced, but they must also be tested by reference to the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. I have tried my best to apply this "test" to these messages, and I find them in accord with that supreme revelation of God's character which we have in our Lord's life and teaching. I therefore gratefully accept them as one more proof that God is still speaking to His people, and I pray that this little book may open the eyes of many to "the real world" that is all round us, to which we are too often blind, for "closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet."'

It is not possible to give in short space any account of the visions dealing with What Happens at Death, The World of Spirits, The Judgment of Sinners, and The State of the Righteous. For that the little book must be read through, but one vision stands by itself and we quote it in full.

The Withered Fig Tree.

'I inquired of them, "Everything is created for some purpose, but it sometimes appears that that purpose is not fulfilled; for instance, the purpose of the fig tree was to produce fruit, but, when the Lord found it fruitless, He withered it up. Can you enlighten me as to whether its purpose was fulfilled or not?"

'A saint replied, "Undoubtedly its purpose was fulfilled, and was fulfilled more fully. The Lord of Life gives life to every creature for a certain specific purpose, but if that purpose is not fulfilled He has power to take back the life in order to fulfil some higher purpose. Many thousands of God's servants have sacrificed their lives in order to teach and uplift others. By losing their lives for others they have helped them, and thus fulfilled the higher purpose of God. And if it is lawful, and a most noble service, for man, who is higher than fig trees and all other created things, to give his life for other men, then how can it be unjust if a mere tree gives its life for the teaching and warning of an erring nation? So through this fig tree Christ taught this great lesson to the Jews, and to the whole world, that those whose lives are fruitless, and who fail in the purpose for which God created them, will be altogether withered and destroyed."

'The facts of history make it abundantly plain to us that the bigoted and narrow Jewish national life of that day was, because of its barrenness, withered away like the fig tree. And in the same way the fruitless lives of others, though outwardly they may appear fruitful, are a cause of deception to others, and will be cursed and destroyed. If any one should object that, when the Lord cursed this fig tree, it was not the fruit season, and figs should not have been looked for, then he should reflect that for doing good there is no fixed season, because all seasons and times are equally appointed for good works, and that he himself should make his life fruitful and thus fulfil the purpose for which he was created.'[1]

Jesus the Teacher.

'Jesus the teacher is far more than the angelic doctor of lovely precepts conceived by the liberalism of the nineteenth century. Jesus discovered and taught a final wisdom; and this wisdom was such that it could be declared only by being lived. Therefore it can be learned from him only as a person. It is necessary to know the Jesus who went to his death to become Messiah in order that we may know Jesus the teacher; unless we understand his death we shall never fully understand his teaching. But this is not because his death was implicit in his teaching; but because his teaching was implicit in his life. We have to know the loneliness, the courage, the human perfection of the man, in order to approach the living reality of what he taught.'[2]

The Man of Men.

'If we can surprise ourselves into unfamiliarity, and hear them [the words of Jesus] as though they were uttered for the first time to-day, one quality shines out from them above all others. These are not the words of a visionary or a dreamer; they are the words of a man who lived completely in this world of men—and lived in it the more completely because his spirit breathed another air. The fundamental detachment he had conquered gave him a more certain command of the mundane reality, as though he saw it distinctly and fully from a mountain-top. He reckons his adversary and his situation in an instant, lets fly his arrow, soft and swift as a smile; and the victory is his. This carpenter of Galilee was the Man of men.'[3]

[1] P. 62 f.
[2] J. M. Murry, *The Life of Jesus*, 179.
[3] *Ibid.* 247.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'To match the new philosophy of Science a new philosophy of Religion must be found'; and Canon B. H. STREETER'S new book on *Reality* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net), from the second chapter of which these words are taken, is more than a search for this new philosophy, it is a genuine contribution to it. The Canon modestly disclaims any special competence to propound such a philosophy: what he does claim to see, or to think that he sees, is 'a line of advance.' No one who reads his book will be inclined to dispute this claim. The book is 'an attempt,' as he tells us in the Introduction, 'to limn out a position which, taken on the whole, is a new one.' Words like these assure us that we are in the hands of a thinker who knows what has been already said, and is confident that he himself has something fresh, even if not final, to say.

The book is in some ways a sign of the times. Its sub-title is 'A New Correlation of Science and Religion,' a subject which within the last year or so has been so ably traversed by Professor J. Y. Simpson and by the various contributors to 'Science, Religion, and Reality,' and it is of much significance that the scholar who so recently in 'The Four Gospels' gave us an elaborate investigation of origins, should immediately follow up that volume by one dealing with the meaning and nature of Reality. It is all to the good that specialists should turn aside, if indeed this be turning aside, to show us the bearing of their special studies on the ultimate problems that concern us all.

The interest of the book is many-sided. Not the least interesting section is the autobiographical Introduction which lets us see how Dr. STREETER was led by his early dissatisfaction with the beliefs in which he had been brought up, to attempt to discover for himself a more satisfactory belief, or at any rate a more stable and satisfactory basis for his beliefs. The essential interest of the book is of course the religious interest, but its power lies in showing how closely implicated with this are the interests of Science, Art, Psychology, Philosophy, and New Testament scholarship, and how illuminating and indispensable are the contributions that each of these departments of intellectual activity makes to any adequate interpretation of Reality.

Throughout the whole discussion we can detect the undertone of the preacher. Sometimes indeed it is more than an undertone. Here, for example: 'as we compose ourselves to rest at night, let us remember to govern mind and thought. We cannot but "suggest" to ourselves *some* thoughts, the effect of which will follow us next day. We have got to make a choice between thoughts of confidence or despair, of power or weakness, of love or hate.' Or here: 'if God's sons are free, they must enter into His purposes and fight His battles.' Or here: 'the end of man is not just to live, but to live as nobly as he can.' These and similar sentences fall quite naturally into the argument, but they suffuse it, even when it is most

distinctly philosophical, with a moral and spiritual glow, and they impart to it a spirit of something like apostolic propaganda. The writer is obviously anxious to communicate to his readers something of the vision and the power which inhere in the view of Reality to which he has worked his own way.

Vision and power—the vision of truth and the power to overcome—these are the things that thoughtful and sinful men need when faced by the riddle of life: and men may find these things in the Religion of which Christ is the centre, in that view of Reality which finds in Him its supreme interpreter or rather the incarnation of its inmost spirit. Thus, while the book is anything but a defence of traditional Christianity, and is best to be described in its author's own words as 'an endeavour to discover Truth,' its long argument issues in the conviction that the truth as to the essential nature of the Universe is the truth as it is in Jesus.

The fundamental contention of the book, he tells us, is that life as we know it is a mirror of the Infinite Life, and throughout it he pleads eloquently for what he describes as the Higher Anthropomorphism. He mercilessly riddles the inadequacies of the merely mechanistic theory of the universe. Even a machine, he reminds us, implies mind and purpose: a mind constructed it, and constructed it for a purpose. Anthropomorphism is not only not a view which the thinker should feel constrained to present apologetically as the best he can offer in view of the limitations of the human mind: it is, in the last analysis, the only adequate view. Conscious life is the fundamental element in Reality, and 'of all the great religious teachers of the world Christ is the most unashamedly anthropomorphic.'

Only in terms of Personality can the ultimate be conceived with anything like approximate adequacy, and the Canon goes so far as to say that to individualize the Deity by the use of a proper name such as Allah or Jehovah is, up to a point, philosophically more sound than to think of Him exclusively under such an abstract or impersonal term as the Absolute. And of this personal God he maintains that His experience of suffering must somehow be real: whatever other perfection might be conceivably predicated of a God who was an apathetic spectator of the world's pain and sorrow, it could not be a moral perfection.

So it comes back to this, that if Jesus be the supreme revelation of the inner quality of Reality, that revelation is focussed, so to speak, in His Cross: for in any religion which is to hold our allegiance the problem of evil must be recognized as central, and it is there, in the Cross of Christ, that that problem is conclusively grappled with. It is His death that gives its meaning to His story, and consequently that furnishes the key to Reality. And 'The Defeat of Evil,' one of the most impressive chapters of the book, works out this idea in its various bearings, showing among other things that justice is not the ultimate quality in the Power behind the universe, but that the Will of God must be the Will to Good, expressing itself 'in action which is curative rather than punitive, generous rather than just.'

Thus the problem of suffering, which had so tormented the saints and thinkers of the Old Testament, is in the New Testament no longer a problem. Illuminated by the Cross of Christ, suffering is seen to be a privilege, 'something shared by God Himself,' who indeed bears the lion's share, 'and the means of His accomplishing the sublimest of all ends'; and those who are initiated by the Cross into the secret of Reality will rejoice not only to 'do their bit,' but to 'bear their bit,' and thus they will become at once fellow-workers and fellow-sufferers in the eternal process, measuring their moral advance by their power to transfer interest in themselves to interest in the Kingdom of God.

Of special interest to religious readers will be Canon Streeter's searching discussion of Prayer, which frankly faces the difficulties with which all prayer, and especially intercessory prayer, has from time immemorial been associated, and which discusses them with due regard to recent psychologi-

cal investigation. In particular he deals with the questions whether prayer is a form of auto-suggestion, and whether intercessory prayer works by telepathy. It is reassuring to find so competent a thinker reaching the conclusion that, while 'prayer brings the inspiration which comes from contact with a personality greater than our own, auto-suggestion in the last resort is in the nature of "dope,"' and to find him also arguing on the assumption that 'there is evidence that intercessory prayer has—at any rate in some cases and under some conditions—brought benefit to persons on whose behalf it was offered.'

The book is not without its incidental criticisms of the contemporary Church. Official Christianity has not always been a brilliant success, and this relative failure the Canon explains as largely due to the fact that the Churches have been content to cherish, and have not publicly discarded, certain ideas of God and His ways which are no longer the highest that man can conceive: and the moral and intellectual sterility of many of the Church's members he explains as in part due to faulty teaching and practice in regard to methods of devotion, which have not been of a kind to establish 'a realized contact with Creative Spirit—the Spirit that makes all things new.'

The subject before the Church Congress at Southport in October was the Eternal Spirit. Already by the 20th of October an account of the Congress had been written by Canon RAVEN at the suggestion of the Bishop of Liverpool. It is published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton with the title *The Eternal Spirit* (2s. 6d. net). The subject which was assigned to Professor BARRY was 'The Holy Spirit in the Church.' His paper was felt to be so important that Canon RAVEN gives it in full.

Professor BARRY feels that his subject is intensely practical because the value of a doctrine is to be measured by its effect in life and conduct. The 'doctrine of the Spirit means in practice—whatever its theological implications—the infusion of a new, divine quality into the manifold activities of mankind—a divine life, imparted through Jesus, and the direct and immediate result of His life and death and resurrection.'

How did this Divine life manifest itself in the earliest times? It manifested itself in 'a community of transfigured people, the centre of whose lives had been shifted, the quality of whose lives had been enriched. That is the first thing that forces itself upon us—this *new quality of sheer living*. It was nothing far-fetched or ecclesiastical, but the emergence on to the field of history, under the pressure of supernatural influence, of finer and richer human material in average, commonplace men and women. Our Lord had described in the Beatitudes that temper and attitude of mind and will which make for the coming of the Kingdom. St. Paul's great lyric in 1 Co 13 is, as it were, the Sermon on the Mount re-written in the light of Pentecost. It is, if you like, a word-portrait of the character of Jesus. But more, it is a description of "Agape"—that distinctively new Christian quality for which no word in our language is adequate. It describes what human life begins to look like when the Spirit gets to work upon it. Men had to seek new words to describe the qualities which began to emerge as the Spirit created them. . . . People were interested in finer things, less absorbed in silly trivialities. (Perhaps it is here that we need the Spirit most.)'

The new qualities work themselves out in different ways. There was a gradual transformation in personal relations—the place of women and children in the family, the acceptance of reciprocal obligations as between the master and the servant. There was a new attitude to work and a new sincerity in social life and a disciplined buoyancy and youthfulness which astonished a disillusioned world. 'The activities of the Christian Community were not merely what we should call "religious": they were economic, social, æsthetic.'

And Christianity poured its new spirit into Art also. 'Not its least artistic achievement is the

New Testament itself, where the broken, rude vernacular of the "Koine" becomes the instrument of a supreme literature. The New Spirit clothed itself in architecture, and though at first the drama was forbidden it (because of its *idolatrous* associations) it embodied itself in sculpture and in painting.' In all the different departments of life the Spirit conferred an indefinable temper which gave a distinctive supernatural quality to the natural goods and activities of life.

But if we come down to the life of to-day, what do we find? Religion is, in the large, 'simply one activity side by side with all the others, not standing even in vital relation to them. Religion is ceasing to be the inspiration of life's best ideals and activities, and obviously that spells a double loss. They are losing their quality and "saltness," and Religion itself is left thin and bloodless, with no strong roots spreading out into life. The Churches as we know them to-day are mainly *devotional* associations, they are not fellowships of life and work. I do not in the least underrate the preciousness of the Church simply as a fellowship of worship. But certainly it is something very much less, and infinitely less rich in content, than the Community of the New Testament.' The practical, urgent problem for to-day is to bring back the power of religion into the world of affairs; to set forth the Spirit in the Church as the soul and power of all life's aims and functions. How is it to be done?

Professor Barry suggests first that we must see that 'all those activities which we commonly call non-religious—Science, Art, Politics, Industry, all worthy human aspirations, even on the purely economic level—all come from the same God as the Church's life does. Their autonomy must be reverently respected, in the sense that there must be no attempt at ecclesiastical control of them. We must not seek to forestall their conclusions or to interfere with or prescribe their methods. But that does not mean that they are "non-religious." . . . The laws of God move at different levels—all flesh is not the same flesh—and theology is incapable of dealing with the laws of God which hold in chemistry. Yet, remember, they are all laws of God.'

The next thing is to see that 'the Holy Spirit of Christian Theology is a unique gift—a revelation—the operation of God in man *through Jesus*, conferring a new, supernatural quality on all the activities of life.' The Church exists to redeem society so that the life of man may express the Christ-Spirit—a thought which is involved in the phrase 'The Body of Christ.'

Should Christianity, then, define our duties? Professor Barry says that is not the function of the Spirit. 'The Spirit imparts the ideal attitude to God and Man and the values of life; its *content*, and the path of actual duty, we are left to find out for ourselves, by dispassionate study of the facts, by the use of our technical and professional skill, in a world that is not yet fully Christianized. That involves a certain delicacy and tension—a sort of Spirit-guided compromise.'

Can the individual Christian, then, mirror Christ? Professor Barry answers No. He can merely 'do his own task in the world in such loyalty to the Spirit as he can. To redeem Society, to mirror Christ in the whole range of Man's activity, is the task of the whole Body, the Christian Church, which is—in its essence—a world-wide Society, whose frontiers are coterminous with humanity. Christianity, that is to say, is still in the making, and its fullest meanings are yet to be disclosed, as the Church grows in extent as well as in depth. It needs the whole race to set forth the riches of Christ.'

The vast expansion of modern knowledge has inevitably led to an increase in specialism. Each worker has more than enough to occupy him within his own department, and the problem of unifying knowledge and harmonizing truth with itself in all its departments becomes ever more difficult. Yet the impulse towards such co-ordination exists in every thoughtful mind, and the need for it does not grow less. For there is a

real danger that the workers in any one field may isolate themselves and create about them a mental atmosphere in which truths from another field cannot breathe and live. We have, therefore, reason to be grateful to any one who makes a serious contribution towards this co-ordination of thought and helps us to see truth as a whole.

Such a contribution has been made in *The Dominion of Man*, by Principal E. Griffith-Jones, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net). It is now a quarter of a century since Principal Griffith-Jones made his mark by his arresting book 'The Ascent through Christ,' in which he dealt in so masterly a way with the doctrine of Redemption in the light of the theory of evolution. Gifted with a mind of wide range and great capacity, a mind intolerant of water-tight compartments and absolutely fearless in the pursuit of truth, he has given us in his latest book a very comprehensive survey of man's relation to God and the Universe—Whence? Why? Whither?

The study is in the main historical and falls into three divisions. Book I. deals with The Making of Man, his natural environment and his physical and mental equipment, with special reference to the evolution of the intellect, the will, and the moral and religious senses. The conclusion reached is that 'in one sense he is the climax of the evolutionary process, the purely vital impulse having reached in him its final expression. In another sense he is the first of a new order of being, *i.e.*, one who has risen into correspondence with a fresh environment, and who is therefore destined for a new function in the hierarchy of being.'

Here biology gives place to history, and in Book II., The Arrival of Man, Principal Griffith-Jones gives a rapid sketch of man's emergence from prehistoric night and his advance, stage by stage, till the foundations of our civilization were laid in the lands which border on the Mediterranean. 'At the roots of modern civilization we have found three main factors, which came to their highest development in the achievements of the three most significant peoples whose habitat lay around the great Inland Sea. The intellectual factor arrived at its finest flower in Greece; the social in Rome; the spiritual in Judea and Galilee. But these were developed historically too much in isolation. Greece was too coldly intellectual; Rome was too harshly political; Israel too aridly religious. It is as though the human personality has been trichotomized—mind and heart and will separated into compartments, and each developed singly and in isolation, apart from the corrective and complementary functions of the others.'

It was needful that these three lines of activity should be harmonized and brought under one principle of development, unless human progress was to be a lop-sided and uncertain movement, perhaps even degenerate and in the end disastrous. Accordingly at this point Jesus Christ appeared in the world, an event of supreme significance. 'He came "in the fullness of the times," gathering up in Himself all the significance of the past, and initiating an era of new possibilities of happiness and progress for the human race.' By His distinctive revelation of God and Nature, of Man and his Destiny, He laid down the principles upon which alone the harmonious evolution of the whole man becomes possible. 'If this conception of the Kingdom of God—the teaching of Jesus concerning God, Man, and Nature—had been accepted as a practical programme of life by the then world, the three streams of historic development round the Inland Sea—that growing point of progress—would have coalesced into a harmonious whole.'

To what extent has this end been achieved? What has hindered it, and how shall it at last arrive? These are questions dealt with in Book III., The Future and Man's Unfinished Tasks. In modern times man has solved five great problems, and, in solving them, has suddenly sprung upon himself five greater problems which press for solution. These are the Problem of Power, the Economic Problem, the Problems of Internationalism, of Eugenics, and of World-Religion. On each of these problems Principal Griffith-Jones has much of interest to say, and he steadily urges the

hopelessness of any solution being reached on the basis of materialistic science. 'So far from true is it that science can take the place of religion as the sovereign guide of life, that we have to safeguard ourselves through religion from the perils of our scientific achievements, est they become the instruments of man's doom instead of the means of his emancipation and enrichment. The gift of *Power*—who shall teach us to use it ethically? The gift of *Wealth*—who shall teach us to make it humanely, to distribute it justly, to use it nobly? The gift of *World-wide intercourse*—who shall teach us how to attain a Great Society that is rich in human benefit, and not a mere dangerous welter of suspicious and contending groups and races? The gift of *controlling the Life-force*—who shall spiritualize for us this perilous power, so as to conserve and develop the best potencies of the race, and help us to realize the higher evolution of the "man that is to be"? Science is the switchboard of life, and shows us how to direct and control its currents, but she cannot ensure that the energies thus released shall be wisely and sanely used. Religion alone can do that. And, therefore, Man needs religion more to-day than ever, just because the New Knowledge has increased man's power for mischief as well as good. Only by the inspirations and restraints of religion can science hope to make the Future of man the climax and glory of his troubled Past.'

The Baptism of Jesus.

By Professor F. C. Burkitt, F.B.A., D.D., Cambridge.

In Lk 3^{22}, where the Voice from heaven at the Baptism of Jesus is reported, there is an important 'various reading.' Instead of 'Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased,' Codex Bezæ and most of the Old Latin MSS. have the words of Ps 2^{7}, 'Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee,' and it was in this form that the verse seems to have been known to Justin Martyr (*Trypho*, § 88 end). Modern scholars, notably Harnack, have been inclined to see in this Psalm-quotation the genuine text of S. Luke's Gospel, and to suggest that the Evangelist derived it from the mysterious and elusive source Q, about which if we do know anything at all it is that it was Luke's source for the substance of the Baptist's preaching and for the story of the Temptation of Jesus, which come respectively just before and just after the story of the Baptism.

The object of the following paper is, among other things, to defend the ordinary text, or rather to show that it is a mere question of the way S. Luke edited his sources. But to explain how I regard the text it will be convenient to approach the textual question by a very roundabout route. Let us consider the Baptism of Jesus in itself and as an element of early Christian tradition.

We begin with Mark, undoubtedly the earliest written 'Gospel,' by which I mean a biographical sketch of the career of Jesus as distinct from good news about a way to escape 'the wrath to come.' We read first that John appeared in accordance with ancient prophecy, and every one went out to him to be baptized in the river Jordan, confessing their sins. Among the rest came Jesus: He was baptized by John, and as He, Jesus, came up from the water He saw the heavens split open and the Spirit coming down into Him like a dove, and there was a Voice from heaven, 'Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased.' That Spirit then forthwith sends Jesus into the wilds, where He stays for forty days tempted by Satan. That, according to Mark, was the preparation of Jesus for His career.

We are so familiar with this story that it has ceased to sound strange to our ears. But it must have seemed rather disconcerting to some early Christians. Not, of course, that the heavens should split open, or that the Spirit should come down in a visible form, or that angels should minister to the Son of God: all that was what might be expected. What was so disconcerting was that Jesus should be baptized, that He should,

so to speak, receive something which looked like absolution or ordination from John the Baptist. Accordingly we find that in the second edition of Mark, *i.e.* the document that we call the 'Gospel according to Matthew,' the Baptism of Jesus is explained away. John here is represented as knowing very well that he ought rather to be baptized by Jesus, but Jesus explains that it is all right, that He must 'fulfil all righteousness,' a vague phrase that apparently means 'all that a pious Jew ought to do.' Further, if 'he saw' in Mk 1^{10} and Mt 3^{16} refers in each case to the last-named nominative singular, *i.e.* if we interpret the words naturally, the opening heavens and the dove are in Mark seen only by Jesus, in Matthew by John. What had been a private experience has become a public event.

Passing by for a moment the account in Luke, let us turn to the Fourth Gospel. It may be said in general that in all ages careful writers introduce at least their principal characters to their readers as they appear, or at the earliest convenient moment afterwards. But the way that 'Jesus' is mentioned in Jn 1^{29} is most peculiar. John the Baptist is formally introduced to us in 1^{6}, 'Jesus Christ' is so named at the end of the Prologue (v.^{17}), where the Evangelist is, as it were, interpreting the whole Gospel. Even here the 'witness' of John—to whom, as I say, we have been introduced—precedes the mention of Jesus Christ, and indeed it is not certain that the whole passage from ὁ ὀπίσω μου to ἐξηγήσατο (vv.$^{15b\text{-}18}$) is not intended to be John's own utterance. In any case up to v.^{29} the Individual called later on (v.^{45}) 'Jesus, Joseph's son from Nazareth,' has not been really introduced to the readers of the Gospel. He just appears, as it were, casually; we do not know who it is, but then John, an approved personage, who has been already introduced to us as a true witness, tells us it is the Lamb of God. And why? John knows that too, for he tells us that on this Jesus he, John, had seen the Spirit coming down and abiding: this was a sign of which he had been miraculously warned. So John testifies to us that Jesus is the Chosen of God, ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (vv.$^{32\text{-}34}$).[1] In other words, John does not baptize Jesus—nothing is said in the Fourth Gospel to imply this—but he is the Witness of the Incarnation.

I have not yet used the long and ugly word 'Adoptionism,' but here I cannot do without it. It is used in a general way to denote those forms of Christology which regard Jesus as having become the Son of God by adoption at some definite point of time, not as being Son of God 'naturally.' In other words, the opposite of Adoptionism is the Catholic phrase 'begotten of the Father.' Adoptionism is not, properly speaking, an early Christian heresy, but rather an early and inadequate Christian theory about Jesus Christ, which was abandoned because it was felt to be inadequate. As used by modern writers on the Gospels there is sometimes, I think, a confusion of thought in the use of the word, or its equivalents. I am sure I have come across writers who have regarded Adoptionist doctrine as anti-Trinitarian. As for the Gospels, Mark is generally recognized as Adoptionist, Jesus becoming the Son of God at baptism; but in the Fourth Gospel it is usually supposed that as the Word of God is set before us as existing from before the beginning of time, therefore the Evangelist must have regarded Jesus as having been the Son of God from birth. I do not think the words of the Fourth Gospel really point in that direction. The Logos is eternal; but it became incarnate in time, at a certain time. Adoptionism is one answer to the question When? I venture to maintain that the Fourth Evangelist was in this sense an Adoptionist, and that he regarded the Incarnation of the Divine Logos in the man Jesus as taking place in John the Baptist's sight. That is the importance of John the Baptist in the Evangelist's eyes: not that John baptized Jesus, but that he was the accredited witness of the Incarnation. The event in the Jordan Valley was thus transformed. The Christians' Lord did not, according to the Fourth Evangelist, undergo the humiliating rite of baptism at John's hands: what had really happened was the actual Incarnation of the Divine in the man Jesus, who was henceforth the Incarnate Logos. And by a special providence John, the acknowledged Prophet of God, was there to witness it.

Before going on to S. Luke let me retell another story of the Incarnation, a story which puts the great event a few years earlier. In the curious Egyptian book called *Pistis Sophia*, Jesus is represented as teaching the disciples secret lore after the Resurrection. At a certain moment (at the end of the First Book) He bids Mary His mother explain what was prefigured by the Psalmist in 'Mercy and Truth are met together.' Mary answers: 'When thou wast little, before the Spirit had come upon thee, while thou wast with Joseph in a vineyard, the Spirit came from on high and came to me in my house, looking like thee, and I had not recognized it and I thought it was thou. And the

[1] This is no doubt the true reading (so ℵ* *e* Syr. *SC*), not *vlós* (as most documents).

Spirit spoke to me, "Where is Jesus, my brother, that I may meet him?" And when it said this to me I was perplexed and thought it was a phantasm to tempt me. But I took it and bound it to the foot of the bed that was in my house till I could go out to you, to thee and Joseph, in the field, and I found you in the vineyard where Joseph was working. But it was so that when thou didst hear me tell the thing to Joseph, thou didst understand and rejoice, and say, "Where is he, that I may see him? For I expect him in this place." But when Joseph heard thee say these words he was troubled, and we went together and entered the house and found the Spirit bound upon the bed, and we looked at thee and saw thou wert like him. And he that was on the bed was unbound, he embraced thee and kissed thee, and thou didst kiss him, and ye became One.'

A naïve tale! But not more naïve than the descent of a πνεῦμα from the heavens and entering into a man.

The Apostles' Creed has a different Christology, as we all know. According to that document Jesus Christ is born—really born—of the Virgin Mary, who had conceived from Holy Spirit. It is not only because this idea is more familiar that it is more satisfactory to us: I venture to think it is also more 'rational,' if I may be allowed the word in this connexion. Nowadays it is the Virgin-birth itself, the physical wonder-tale, that is the stumbling-block. But it was not such a stumbling-block to the Christians of the first and second centuries. They had little idea of the uniformity of natural processes, and the example of Paul of Samosata, who practically rejected the Godhead of Jesus Christ while accepting the Virgin-birth, shows that this belief is not an infallible touchstone of orthodoxy. But I do think that the Christians came to feel the difficulty of believing that any human being could *become* Divine during his lifetime. Apotheosis might indeed take place after death, but there was always something monstrous in the idea that any mundane event, even the fact of becoming Emperor, could work such a miracle—at least to those who still believed, as Jews and Christians did, in the Living God.

Very well, then, Jesus was always Divine, from the very moment that He became human. But where shall we find this view in the New Testament? Here let me answer, with the editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity* (ii. 200), to whose very important discussion of the subject I must refer my readers, 'there is no other document than Luke which treats the divine sonship of Jesus as beginning with his birth of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary.'[1] I should add that Professors Foakes Jackson and Lake point out that by 'Luke' they mean both Acts and the Third Gospel. We have come round to Luke by a circuitous route, but we come with the conviction that Luke is the most anti-Adoptionist of the Evangelists, if not of all the New Testament writers. I think this fact, for it is a fact, should give us pause before we regard the true reading of Lk 3^{22} (whichever alternative we choose) as a corner-stone of Adoptionist doctrine. The third Evangelist was a most capable writer: he had S. Mark's work before him, and we may be sure that if he decided to alter this to suit his new Gospel, or to choose another account altogether, it will not be more Adoptionist, but less Adoptionist, than the narrative of Mark. If on critical grounds we prefer a form of the text which substitutes Ps 2^{7} for Mark's version of the Voice from heaven, we must regard it as in Luke's judgment a safer, more 'orthodox' form.

This, indeed, is what he has done elsewhere. He substituted 'Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit' (= Ps 31^{5}) for the mysterious and disquieting 'Why hast thou forsaken me?' of Mk 15^{34}. And it is especially to be noted that Justin Martyr (*Trypho*, § 88), who is the earliest witness for treating the Voice at the Baptism as identical with Ps 2^{7}, regards it as non-Adoptionist in meaning, and as a further proof that what happened during the earthly career of Jesus had been already foretold by David. The fact that 'to-day' had been so long ago uttered by David showed that this 'begetting' had long been foreordained.

With an 'orthodox' interpretation the famous Western reading becomes less alluring—I had almost said less alarming. The argument 'this is the less conventional, it must be genuine,' which I venture to think is at the back of much of its modern acceptance, loses its force. On the plain literary question I feel that the fact that the Old Syriac does not support Codex Bezæ here is a strong argument for the ordinary text. But these things may be left to specialists: I am content here to indicate my reasons for thinking that either reading means the same thing.

But you will say, is it not likely that the Western reading, whether S. Luke adopted it or not, was the reading of Q? If the account of John the Baptist came from Q, and the account of the

[1] No doubt this view is also present in the Gospel of Matthew, a work which clearly expresses the difficulty felt in the fact of the Baptism of Jesus by John.

Temptation came from Q, and there is a notable various reading in between, differing from the account of the Baptism in Mark, must not the various reading also come from Q?

Of course, we must begin by remembering how uncertain and shadowy any detailed reconstruction of Q must be. But now we have shown that the various reading with Ps 2^7 is quite innocuous, a mere literary equivalent for the common text which agrees with Mark, we must go on to consider the improbability that Q ever contained any account of the *Baptism* at all. Is it not likely that Q told the tale of the visit of Jesus to John more in the manner of the Fourth Gospel? The actual Baptism, as we see from the narrative in Matthew, was a stumbling-block. It is very lightly passed over in Luke's account: you have only to cut out *βαπτισθέντος καί* from Lk 3^{21} and the Baptism disappears. I cannot regard Lk $3^{21.22}$ as anything else than St Luke's rewriting of Mk 1^{9-11}: I see no sign in those two verses of any extraneous source. And therefore I doubt very much whether Q ever included any account of our Lord's Baptism, though it undoubtedly did contain the story of His three Temptations.

That Jesus really was baptized by John I do not doubt: the critical result of what I have been here bringing forward is that we owe it to Mark, and to Mark alone, that this remarkable historical fact has been preserved in the Christian tradition. As I view the matter, it is one of the most signal proofs how near the sources used by Mark were to the actual events: you cannot imagine any Christian inventing the tale. And where did Mark get it from? No doubt from S. Peter, but I cannot accept as historical the picture in the Fourth Gospel which represents Peter as a disciple and confidant of John the Baptist. I cannot believe either that our story of the Baptism comes from John the Baptist. If it had come from that source, how can we believe that he would have later sent his doubting message to Jesus? Rather I would think that both the story of the Temptation and the story of the Baptism together with the Voice from Heaven come from our Lord Himself. We shall get little by detailed examination of the story, except that I feel it futile to regard it as 'parabolic.' I feel sure He regarded the Voice from heaven as real. We know the impression that John made upon Jesus—'no one born of woman greater than John'—and somehow contact with this inspired man together with the bath in Jordan, which at least signified a new start, revealed Jesus to Himself. He had gone down to the Valley with the rest, with the crowd: as He comes out of the water He realizes He is different from the rest, Son of God in some other more individual sense than that in which He and His brothers and His friends had said *Ābīnu*, 'Our Father,' Sabbath after Sabbath. He must go away by Himself and think it out, and when He is alone the thought comes, 'If you are the Son of God—what then?'

It is a wonderful drama of personal development, and we see it all as from a distant height far-off and in a haze. But it does hang together, as we say; it is not inhuman, or self-contradictory. It is like biography and history, not myth. We may feel that we have inherited a more thoughtful Christology than that which is implied by the narrative of Mark, as it stands, for that which we call in our fellow-men 'genius' and 'personality' is innate and not acquired. Nevertheless I feel sure that but for the phase of nascent Christology which is called Adoptionism we should never have had transmitted to us the historical fact that our Lord was actually baptized by John.

Details of the Various Readings in Lk 3^{22} f

(i) *σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.*
ℵB and Greek MSS. generally, Latin *vg* (also *e* and *fq*, see below), all Syriac texts (*hiat.* Syr. *C*), all Coptic and Armenian, etc.

(ii) *υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγεννηκάσε* (= Ps 2^7).
D Lat. *a b c ff l r* Justin Clement Methodius Tyconius Juvencus Faustus (*ap. Aug.*, very expressly).

Justin Martyr twice refers to the Voice (*Trypho*, 88 and 103), each time equating it with Ps 2^7. Clement of Alexandria does the same but adds *ἀγαπητός* to *εἶ σύ*, perhaps by a lapse of memory. The most contentious point in the Latin evidence is the value of *e*, which has *tu es filius meus dilectus in te bene sensi*. This MS., which is the best surviving authority for the old African Latin text in Luke and John, has been occasionally revised and assimilated to later texts. Here *in te bene sensi* sounds like genuine 'African' (so *k* in Mt 12^{18}): the Vulgate has *in te complacuit* (sic) *mihi*. On the other hand, *dilectus* (for *dilectissimus*) is un-African: *e* has it here and in Lk 9^{35}, but they are the only instances in the Gospels where an 'African' text has *dilectus*, and in 9^{35} it is almost certainly a correction for *electus*.

It should be added that Cyprian (*Test.* ii. 8) quotes Ps 2^7, followed by Lk $1^{41f.}$ to prove that the

eternal Son of God must be generated again according to the flesh. It is not likely therefore that he took an Adoptionist view of Lk 3^{22}.

The external evidence is therefore very equally balanced. The fact that no Syriac text supports D may be explained away by the known tendency of the Sinai Palimpsest and other early Syriac authorities to the harmonization of parallels. It is worth notice that there is no tangible evidence for Ps 2^{7} in Matthew or Mark, only in Luke, which might seem to suggest that D here preserves the true Lucan text.

Literature.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Two large books on the same subject have just been published, and the subject is the present condition and future prospects of the English Church. The first is the work of one hand only: *The English Church: A Retrospect and a Forecast,* by the Right Rev. J. E. C. Welldon, D.D., Dean of Durham. The second is from a number of hands: *The Future of the Church of England,* a volume of essays, by the Dean of Winchester, the Bishop of Manchester, Canon Cunningham, the Bishop of Liverpool, the Bishop of Plymouth, the Bishop of Winchester, and others. Dr. Welldon's book is published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton, and costs 12s. 6d. net. The other comes from Messrs. Longmans, is edited by that indefatigable anthologist, Sir James Marchant, and costs 9s. net.

Dr. Welldon's volume has the advantage of being the product of one mind, and that a mind of singular clearness and sanity. He discusses frankly the religious situation as he sees it, and gives us his judgment on the measures which he considers necessary to ameliorate it. He seems to occupy a somewhat detached position so far as any school or party is concerned. Each of the three sections into which the Anglican Church can be divided at present is reviewed in turn and its strength and weakness fairly estimated. Dr. Welldon would seem to be neither High nor Low, nor even Broad. Perhaps he would claim to belong to a fourth school, which a famous person once named the Deep Church. Dr. Welldon has a generous judgment to pass on the status and the religious value of Nonconformity. And on the question of re-union, which he discusses at length, his verdict is one that, if accepted on both sides, would almost certainly lead to an understanding. He admits that the demand from the Episcopal side for reordination of Free Church ministers is an impossible demand, if for no other reason than that it will not be yielded. It has already, indeed, been definitely declined. Dr. Welldon, however, suggests that a better way would be to acknowledge the orders of the present ministers on the condition that all future ordination would be Episcopal. He is not, indeed, enthusiastic about re-union. His thought travels rather in the direction of a confederation of Churches. On other disputed points Dr. Welldon is moderate. He recognizes that the case for Apostolic Succession in the fullest sense is weak, but he contends that history (in the broad interpretation of it) lends strong support to the value of Episcopacy. The only point on which he is not moderate is his attitude to Romanism, of which there is a scathing exposure in one of the early chapters.

In the final chapter we have Dr. Welldon's forecast of the future of his Church. It is rather a statement of what he thinks ought to be if the Church is to hold and increase its influence on the national life. His points may be summarized in a few sentences. The age of authority is past, and the religious life of the future will be governed by the principle of the Reformation. The problem of to-morrow is the reconciliation of liberty and Christianity. If this is to be done successfully the Creed will require to be simplified. This in turn will lead to an approximation between the Church of England and other Churches. But this is not the only or most urgent demand. The Church must show herself worthy of confidence by her practical service and particularly by her concern for the social well-being of the people. Finally, the whole question of the place of women in the Church has to be decided. Dr. Welldon on this question is very 'advanced.' He contemplates, with approval, the ordination of women to the ministry on the same terms as men. On this note the book closes, and one leaves it with a warm

feeling of admiration for the great qualities of mind and heart which lie behind it.

There is a good deal in the book of essays which have been brought together by Sir James Marchant which chimes with Dr. Welldon's conclusions, though the book does not impress us in the same way. The subjects are more sharply distinguished, and we have Bishop Temple writing on 'The Faith of the Twentieth Century,' Canon Cunningham on 'The Training of the Clergy,' Lt.-Col. Martin on 'The Work of the Church Assembly,' Bishop David on 'Education and the Church,' Bishop Masterman on 'The Church and Political and Economic Problems,' Canon Bate on 'Re-union,' while Bishop Woods sums up.

The most interesting essay by far is Bishop Temple's on the future Creed. He deals with the influence on the Christian Creed of four things, astronomy, biology, psychology, and the scientific habit of mind. His conclusion is that nothing has been altered in the substance of the faith. Naturally the essay is well-informed and suggestive. It exhibits also a breadth of mind which will seem to some people almost heretical. 'The natural interpretation of the Ascension is not to regard it as removal to another place in the astronomical universe, but as an acted parable signifying His liberation from all limitations of time and space.' The essay generally is a most refreshing and reassuring deliverance. The chapters which touch on the training of the clergy are rather depressing. The shortage of ordinands is alarming, and the training of the future priests is far from ideal. Suggestions of a drastic character are made on both points. If only money can be got to pay the expenses of men who are unable to bear the charge themselves, any number required can be got. And to this financial point the Church must address herself. The essay on the duty of the Church on social and political questions is sensible both in its spirit and its conclusions. There is something vague and unsatisfactory, however, about everything that is said on the subject of Re-union. There seems to be an unwillingness to depart from the condition of reordination, and an attempt is made to defend it by a new interpretation of the term 'valid.' On the whole the field of current religious facts and influences is fairly covered in a book which is thoroughly in earnest throughout on the themes, great and small, with which it deals. The Bishop of Winchester sums up in an essay which emphasizes the spiritual tasks of the Church, and lays stress especially on the need of a spiritual temper which can only come from a vital faith in the unseen.

KANT AND RELIGION.

Heine pictures Kant demolishing God by the pure reason just as the French revolutionaries demolished earthly tyrants. Then in a fit of pity for his God-fearing old servant Lampe he restores all by the practical reason. Heine thereby hints a doubt as to the sincerity of Kant's personal attitude to religion and his constant use of 'als ob' —'as if'—lays him open to suspicion. Even his old pastor and patron Schultz early felt uneasy on this point.

The present volume, *Kant's Philosophy of Religion* (Clarendon Press; 12s. 6d. net), which gives the development of Kant's religious views from 1755 ('The General Natural History') onwards dissipates any such doubt. Professor Kemp Smith's Kant[2] (Appendix C., pp. 607–641) gave the first full account in English of the loose MSS. found after Kant's death and edited in 1920 by Adickes —'Opus Postumum'—and Professor Webb by means of this new light can carry the development of Kant's mind beyond 1798, the date of 'Der Streit der Facultäten' right up to 1804, the date of Kant's death. We thus see Kant correcting and maturing and enlarging his views right up to the end.

Dr. Loebb's volume is mainly expository and the attitude to Kant is appreciative. As we read we see Kant before us as the Great High Prophet of categorical morality. Here Kant takes his stand against nature and revealed religion alike, for he felt the danger to morality from both sides. His constant bugbear was any attempt on the part of religion either by personal communion with God or by any definite religious acts to circumvent morality. That is why he felt that for any one to be discovered in the act of private prayer was a cause of shame; and that objective views of the Atonement as a ground of forgiveness or grace, or indeed any purely religious act, savoured of either Schwärmerei (enthusiasm) or Pfaffentum (papistry, or reliance for God's favour and help on something not moral).

Varhinger well sums up Kant's position (vol. ii. 'History of Philosophy,' p. 246)—'der rechte Weg geht nicht von der Begnadigung zur Tugend sondern umgekehrt'—according to Kant the right way is not from the activity of grace to virtue, but the reverse. Professor Webb says all that can be said to modify this view, and we are grateful to him for it, yet he recognizes that it is essentially true of Kant. The result is that in spite of his inflexible moral emphasis, and although he admits

the inherent sinfulness of man and the existence of a cosmical evil principle and asserts the necessity of conversion he fails to allow God's grace any place—or a most meagre one—in the liberation of the soul, he empties historical Christianity of its significance and makes Christian worship purely spectacular. No system ever stood more in need of a gospel than Kant's, but in what he conceives the interests of morality he will on no account admit the Divine help into the adytum of the conscience. If we may so put it, Kant is the typical Pelagian of the conscience, though in his analysis of the moral nature he is Augustinian; and we would in advance express our gratitude to Professor Webb if in a future edition he devoted as he so well could a chapter or even two to this all-important subject. Meanwhile that must not debar us from thanking him for the lucidity and fulness of his exposition of Kant's true position and permanent value among the philosophies of religion, and especially for his emphasis on Kant's central position, that religion can never afford either by ritual or sacrament, by subconsciousness or numinosity (Otto) to circumvent the moral.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH.

A book of quite unusual excellence has been written by a layman on one of the most difficult questions relating to the Christian faith—*Was Christ really Born of a Virgin? An Answer for Laymen*, by Mr. T. H. Yardley, M.A., with a Foreword by the Bishop of Central New York (Morehouse Publishing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; $1.50). The excellence of the book lies in this that, while presenting strongly the case for an affirmative answer, the author does not exaggerate his case or over-emphasize the place which this particular article of belief holds in the Faith. He points out, for example, more than once that our faith in the Deity of Christ does not depend on it, and that St. Paul was preaching the Deity of Christ before the fact of the Virgin Birth was known except to a few. 'We must not base upon it either our faith in Christ or our love to Christ.' That is one instance of the calm, sensible judgment which the writer brings to bear upon the whole subject. And this gives to his argument an added persuasiveness.

We draw attention to the book because it contains the most persuasive argument for the Virgin Birth as a fact that we have yet seen. The writer is a layman and is very modest about his own qualifications. He need not be, for he has mastered the literature of the subject, and shows everywhere an easy competence which few 'professionals' could excel. At the outset he sums up the influences which have had an unsettling effect on this belief, the modern 'intellectual' theology, the present-day reaction against the reality of miraculous happenings, the vague but widespread distrust of the historical accuracy of the Bible, and, finally, all the popular setting forth of Jesus the Man, rather than Jesus the Incarnate Son of God. That is his diagnosis and it shows remarkable penetration. In his positive argument he deals with the historical trustworthiness of the gospel narratives, with the Birth stories, with the question of miracle, with the 'silence' of much of the New Testament about a Virgin Birth, and with more general implications of the truth. He rightly emphasizes the importance of the general attitude in which we approach the subject. If, for example, we come to it with a belief in the Deity of Christ, it will present far less difficulty than it will if we come to it with a 'humanistic' view of Jesus. His treatment of the 'silence' is effective; the only flaw in it is that he does not meet the argument that if Mary knew of Christ's true nature she could not have tried to stop His ministry under the impression that He was 'beside Himself.' This, however, is a book to be reckoned with at a time when the case from the other side is so often and so vigorously presented.

THE BABYLONIAN NEW YEAR'S FESTIVAL.

A valuable contribution to our knowledge of *The Babylonian Akîtu Festival* (Andr. Fred. Host & Son, Kgl. Hofboghandel, Copenhagen) has been made by Dr. Svend Aage Pallis, who claims to be here attempting 'for the first time to collect all the material known up to the present date from the Assyro-Babylonian literature and the archæological excavations (especially at Babylon), and on the basis thereof to review what may be learned both as to the ceremonial of the festival and its religious significance.' The available material furnished by the cuneiform texts, some of which are mutilated, is difficult to correlate, and its real significance is largely conjectural, but Dr. Pallis has focussed the material and reached reasonable conclusions in this learned book.

The Babylonian New Year's Festival was celebrated at the vernal equinox in the month of Nisan, but the meaning of the name of the festival, *akîtu*, is quite obscure. Dr. Pallis argues that scholars

have gone wrong in attempting to explain the word on a Semitic basis, and that it would seem to be originally Sumerian. The facts of the festival appear to be these: 'Marduk leaves Esagila in a festive procession to meet other gods coming from distant towns, the most important of these deities being Nabu from Borsippa. The latter join in the procession and together they proceed to "the chamber of destiny," where the "destiny" of the coming year is determined by the assembled deities, Nabu being their scribe. At this festival, too, the king receives his investiture as ruler of Sumer and Akkad at the hand of the god, and a Sacred Marriage takes place between the god and goddess.' These various items are discussed in detail, which includes also a discussion of the topography of Babylon. The festival, however, was celebrated in many other places besides Babylon. The meaning of each item in the festival has been variously interpreted. Pallis maintains, for example, that the destinies determined at it should not be interpreted as a list of the fortunate or unfortunate events destined to take place in the coming year, but rather that 'the determination of destiny is a positive creation of fruitfulness, peace, and happiness for the coming year.' The chief events of the festival were the death drama with Marduk as the leading character, and the battle drama in which the resurrected Marduk defeats his enemies, the Sacred Marriage probably bringing the festival to a close. It is the merit of the Danish scholar to have seen that the facts of the festival imply two quite distinct stages of civilization, though doubtless the worshippers themselves would not be conscious of this distinction. These stages are the agricultural and the urban. Traces of primitive agricultural civilization are to be found in the dramatic representation of Marduk's death and resurrection, and in the Sacred Marriage, while the urban mode of thought is displayed in the theological 'determination of destinies,' and in the fact that the chief divine performers in the festival take part in it in the form of statues.

The discussion is enriched with numerous references in transliterated cuneiform. The book is anything but light reading, but it will be read with interest by all who desire to recover the facts and the spirit of ancient Assyro-Babylonian religion.

THE RESURRECTION NARRATIVES.

Mr. Gardner-Smith justly calls his work—*The Narratives of the Resurrection* (Methuen; 6s. net)—'a critical study.' It is critical indeed. He works over the gospel records of the Resurrection with great minuteness, starting difficulties at every step, scenting discrepancies on every hand, and finding the whole 'a jumble of contradictory statements.' The writers, it seems, are at times unable to be consistent with themselves for two consecutive sentences, or even for one sentence. Matthew puts two contradictory notes of time side by side, and the explanation is that, having written the second, 'he forgot to erase the words he had already written.' The Fourth Evangelist suffers from a like shortness of memory. His story of the Lord's appearance at the Sea of Galilee is a combination of three different traditions. That they are very imperfectly dovetailed together is evidenced by 'the cutting off of the end of the story of Peter. He jumps out of the boat, but nothing is said of his getting to shore and meeting the Lord. The author becomes absorbed in the account of the invitation to the meal which he combines, not altogether successfully, with the miraculous draught, and he forgets that he has left Peter in the water.' The ineptitude of the Evangelists being so great, it is little wonder that the apocryphal gospel of Peter should be called in as a witness whose testimony in some particulars is to be preferred to the Canonical Gospels.

When the narratives are riddled and sifted, what residuum of solid fact is left? Very little indeed. The experiences of the women at the sepulchre are thus summarily disposed of. 'They came to the wrong place and mistook an empty tomb for the one they were seeking. A young man of whose identity we know nothing sought to correct their mistake, pointing to another tomb as "the place where they laid him." Terrified at the unexpected apparition and covered with confusion at the failure of their plan, the women ran away.' And that was all there was in it! Why this amiable young man should be called 'an apparition,' and why his kindly words should strike such terror, is not explained. What became of the body of Jesus, why His enemies did not produce it, and what induced a multitude in Jerusalem to believe the Resurrection story, the writer does not stop to consider. Belief in the Resurrection sprang up and flourished, and then the women began to tell their story. The young man became, first an angel, then the Lord Himself; appearances were multiplied and magnified till legend reaches its full height in the apocryphal gospel of Peter, where the Lord emerges from the tomb followed by His cross and accompanied by two angels whose heads touch the sky, His own head rising above the sky.

Does the writer, then, reject the Resurrection? By no means. Something decisive did happen. The birth and history of the Church are sufficient proof of that. Accordingly it must be assumed that there was some sort of appearance, possibly more than one, to the disciples in Galilee, convincing them that the spirit of Jesus had survived death. Here at last Mr. Gardner-Smith digs himself in, and confidently declares his position impregnable. Most readers will feel, on the contrary, that it is peculiarly open to attack from both flanks, for it labours under the difficulties both of faith and unbelief.

The aim of the writer is to conserve Christianity as a purely spiritual religion, liberated from the contingencies of time and sense. He frankly confesses his distrust of history. He is, moreover, in manifest bondage to the crude old theory of matter as something hard and indestructible, and completely antithetic to the spiritual. There is, of course, nothing new in all this.

TILLOTSON.

Like the Holy City of the seer's vision, Dr. Moffatt's mind has many gates, all of them always open, and through these all kinds of knowledge are constantly pouring in; and many sorts of rich merchandise—the bales piled high—keep streaming out to us.

It is long since we had his book upon John Owen. And now, with broad catholicity, he gives us a companion volume, but from a very different school—*The Golden Book of Tillotson* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net).

The excellent life with which the book opens comes from a full mind, unweighted by its stores of knowledge, moving easily among its riches. And there follows a long selection of choice passages, collected under the three headings of 'Discussions and Arguments,' 'Passages of Exposition,' and 'Sayings and Sentences.' All are arresting in a tense degree. It were hard to say whether one is impressed most by the short, sharp stab of some deep and perfectly phrased thought, or by the strength and sanity of the handling of Scripture; or by the balance and unflustered confidence of the arguments heaping themselves up in an inexorable kind of way until, like Bagehot with Butler, one is conscious of a strong disinclination to disagree. There is little, if any, passion, and no heat, at least no burning heat. But there is the quietness of utter honesty and absolute conviction. Moreover, there is a singular chastity of style—a style never flabby nor obese, but always spare and clean and athletic. Indeed, when one considers how small a place Tillotson holds in people's thoughts, this seems a singular instance of Bacon's saying that the river of fame often upholds things light and swollen, bobbing along it down the centuries, but often drowns things weighty and solid.

JOHN WYCLIF.

Dr. H. B. Workman, Principal of Westminster College, well known for his writings on mediæval Church History, has recently written a most useful and valuable book—a labour of years—reflecting high credit on English historical scholarship: *John Wyclif: A Study of the English Medieval Church* (Oxford University Press; 2 vols., 30s. net). It is a book which may be worthily set alongside of Lechler's biography of Wyclif, and it has had the advantage of drawing upon later researches.

It is curious to note that great as was Wyclif's influence upon his contemporaries at Oxford and among the English gentry, not to speak of his influence upon Hus and others abroad, and great as his influence continued to be in the towns and villages of eastern and southern England, where 'a genuine flame of lollardy, lighted at his torch,' lasted here and there among the lower classes right down to the Reformation, comparatively little is known for certain about the life and career of this 'last of the schoolmen' and 'first of the reformers.'

Dr. Workman would not claim to have thrown much more light on this matter, though he has made real contributions towards the discussion of it. One result of his researches—it is interesting to notice—has been to confirm the opinion concerning Wyclif which even Arundel could not but express, that he was 'a great clerk' and 'a perfect liver.'

The value of Dr. Workman's book may be said to be twofold. In the first place he has presented at first hand an account of Wyclif's doctrine as schoolman, politician, and reformer such as would have been scarcely possible for an English scholar before this generation, in which through the publications of the 'Wyclif Society' the contents of the Latin MSS. of the reformer in Prague and Vienna have been made accessible to all. Dr. Workman brings out clearly, among other things, Wyclif's scholastic opposition to nominalism and its bearing on his view of Transubstantiation, the Erastian flavour of his political doctrine, his attitude towards the Papacy, so like Luther's ('Were there a hundred

popes and all the friars turned into cardinals, their opinions in matters of faith should not be accepted except in so far as they are founded on Scripture '), not to speak of his Augustinian predestinarianism with its reaction—this point of theology being here conjoined with the Scriptural principle—upon the Catholic system.

But in the second place, it is much more than a biography of Wyclif that Dr. Workman has given us. His aim has also been to provide an ample setting for Wyclif's life. Accordingly, he has made a fresh study, in the light of material that was not before Lechler, of the conditions of the English Mediæval Church in the fourteenth century; and not only so, he has endeavoured to say something—indeed, sometimes, everything that may be said—about the various places and persons associated with the story of Wyclif.

Of especial interest to the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will be the chapter on 'Wyclif and the Bible,' in which it is maintained that 'Wyclif's' translation was the first of the whole Scriptures, or of any considerable portion, done into Middle as distinct from Early English; as also the chapter on 'The Poor Preachers,' in which there is an informative account of mediæval methods of preaching.

Dr. Workman promises us a further volume on 'The Origins of Nonconformity,' and here is the judgment which may be regarded as effecting the transition to it: 'The Anglican Settlement owed little directly to Wyclif's influence; he should rather be regarded as the stern, unbending forerunner and father of the Puritans, Covenanters, and Nonconformists of Great Britain and America.'

FRANCIS THOMPSON.

Francis Thompson has, it seems, a sure place among the immortals. And this for various reasons. His rhymes can, at times, be crude and rather shocking. Load — God; leas — purchase. But even Keats's ear could sometimes tolerate inexplicable slips. And how exquisite is Thompson's artistry when he chooses, as he almost always does. Upon occasion he can fling words about in prodigal profusion. And yet this spendthrift was, when he cared, the master of an almost Horatian skill of saying the final thing with almost no words at all. That in itself is enough. But he has another claim. Foreigners are always struck by this that our poets have been apt to be our prophets also. They have been great spokesmen for God. And Thompson is another who has brought a Divine message to many hearts, a reading of this puzzling life of ours that has consoled and heartened staggered minds.

Few men love him more than does Dr. Hutton, whose soul rings out in unison with every note as Thompson's fingers strike them. And in *Guidance from Francis Thompson in Matters of Faith* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net), he eagerly shares some of what he has found in him. It is an admirable introduction to the poet's teaching, a strong light making the darker places bright and plain for stumbling feet.

An interesting, if in parts somewhat weird, little book on the gracious experience of the spiritual life, is called *Blessedness Explained*, by the Rev. R. P. Byers, M.A., B.D. (Allenson; 3s. 6d. net). It deals with spiritual illumination, the human heart, the human spirit, problems of Christian experience, and cognate topics. 'In trying to localise the heart [in the Scripture sense] a good way is to measure from the larynx or Adam's apple downward about four or five inches to the point where it branches into the left and right bronchi, which respectively are one and two inches in length.' This is the seat of the emotions. The book is not physiological, however, and there is a good deal of helpful and earnest meditation in it.

A delightful book for children is *A Pilgrimage in Fairyland*, by a Pilgrim called Daisy Sewell (Allenson; 3s. 6d. net). The book consists of eight tales of imagination, all deeply religious, and all told with charm and simplicity. There are three illustrations in colour by Jeannie McConnell, of which we like the second and third, but not the first. It is difficult to render one's conception of Jesus in pictorial form, but it is essential that it should express both strength and gentleness. The book, as a whole, is a very delightful achievement.

A volume which will be found suggestive in the preparation of short addresses and helpful for devotional reading is *Hymn Studies: Their Message in Biography and Devotion*, by the late Rev. James H. Hodson, B.D., of St. Andrews. About twenty-four of the best known hymns are picked out; the studies contain an account of the author, and the thought in the hymn is worked out verse by verse, and illustrative material also is given in so far as it illuminates the hymn. The publishers of the volume are Messrs. H. R. Allenson Ltd., and the price is 5s. net.

Mr. David Watson Rannie was a fine type of scholar and Christian gentleman. Unlike most Scottish scholars, he inherited an adequate competence and was able to devote himself without distraction to his favourite study of English literature, of which he became both a discerning critic and an inspiring teacher. His widow and son have issued a memorial volume entitled *Scenery in Shakespeare's Plays, and Other Studies* (Blackwell; 10s. 6d.). It is the record of a singularly beautiful and useful life. Some of the studies which occupy the main part of the book have been previously published, but they are well worth preserving in more permanent form. Besides the paper which gives its title to the volume, there are articles on Prose Style and Keats's Epithets which reveal the nicest discrimination and the most exquisite taste. Other noteworthy papers deal with Sir Walter Scott, Dr. John Brown, and Cromwell's Major-Generals.

There is already a library of missionary books on Uganda, but the story is so romantic and so faith-inspiring that the jubilee year of the C.M.S. Mission could not be allowed to pass in silence. *Uganda in Transformation—1876–1926*, by the Right Rev. H. G. Jones, D.D. (C.M.S.; 3s. 6d. net), does not profess to be a complete history of the Mission. 'It only attempts in a series of pen pictures to convey the impressions of one who had unusual opportunities of insight into certain portions of the work.' These pictures, however, are so vivid that they convey a very adequate idea of the whole field covered and of the wonderful progress made. The book includes interesting discussions of the Land, Labour, and Race Problems, which show no signs of becoming less acute. An excellent gift-book, likely to stir the enthusiasm of generous hearts and draw fresh workers into the field.

An earnest appeal for a policy of aggressive evangelism in the Church is made in a pamphlet by Canon R. E. Roberts, M.A., *The Church Advancing: Short Essays on the Present Opportunity* (Wells Gardner; 1s. net). There is no depression in the frank picture of present-day religious 'aloofness,' to use the writer's word, or in his analysis of its causes. But the facts are faced and the Church is exhorted to deal with them in the only possible way, by a spirit of adventure and positive evangelism. This is 'our primary duty,' and the duty is not only pressed, but it is guided on its way by a chapter on 'How to evangelise.' A timely little book.

We envy Dr. Mursell's output. It is only a month or two since we noticed one of his books, and now we have another in our hands. The title is *Footnotes*, and the publishers this time Messrs. Gay & Hancock (3s. 6d. net). *Footnotes* are Dr. Mursell's light and humorous musings on a pedestrian journey in the north of Ireland. This kind of writing can only be done well if it is done quickly and easily, and there is a delightful spontaneity here. The publishers have bound the volume attractively in leaf-green with black lettering, and with a strong and artistic paper cover in the same colouring. There are charming pen-and-ink illustrations by Isobel H. Walker.

A new and revised edition has been issued of *Death and the Life Beyond*, by the Rev. F. C. Spurr (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). The writer explains that two events, the War and the sudden loss of a beloved child, have led to this revision. Some stress is laid upon the evidence of Spiritualism, but in the main the teaching is based on Scripture. The reasoning throughout is somewhat loosely knit, and in matters of detail the exegesis is coloured by the writer's prepossessions, but there runs through it all a warm glow of Christian feeling and the light of a great hope which make it heartsome reading, and it will bring comfort and renewal of faith to many.

Music in Church Worship, by the Rev. G. Wauchope Stewart, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net), is a notable addition to the Baird Lectures. It was a most happy inspiration which led the Trustees to the choice both of the lecturer and of the subject. The book is in the main historical and, while it gives an outline of music in the Mediæval, Apostolic, and Jewish Churches so far as that is known, it deals principally with the forms of music which have found favour among Protestants. After discussing the value of music as an aid to worship, and the kind of music suited for use in worship, the writer goes on to treat in succession of Psalmody, Hymnody, the Choir and the Organ. While full of interesting historical information the book contains many practical hints which should prove valuable to leaders of praise in all the churches. Take this on the spirit of joy in worship: 'Surely it is time that we put away the notion that God likes to see His children making themselves miserable, that the worship of God's house is an obligation laid upon us to be performed with a sort of sullen devotion, and that the only music befitting divine service is that

which reflects the gloom which we associate with the very thought of religion. Hadyn was once asked why his Church music was so cheerful. He replied, "When I think upon God, my heart is so full of joy that the notes dance and leap, as it were, from my pen, and since God has given me a cheerful heart, it will be pardoned me that I serve Him with a cheerful spirit." ' Many humble worshippers will agree with Dr. Stewart when he says, 'I contend that one of the things we have a right to demand in our Church music is that it be music that does express what we actually feel, not what the Church authorities think we ought to feel.' And the attention of organists everywhere might be called to the fine eulogy pronounced by Sir John Goss on the well-known organist of his day, George Cooper: 'He always places the worship of God first, then the composer's views or intentions, his choir next, then his organ, and himself last.' 'To make the enumeration complete,' Dr. Stewart adds, 'one would have liked to see the congregation included; but so far as the first and last places are concerned, there can be no question as to the correctness of the order. Only when he puts the glory of God in the foremost place and his own interest last can the organist, or indeed any one who makes any contribution to the worship of the sanctuary, worthily discharge his office.'

The former Principal of Emmanuel College, Brisbane, the Rev. Richard Glaister, D.D., has just published a volume of sermons through Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton. The title is *The Beauty of the Lord* (7s. 6d. net). These sermons are for the most part sketches of Bible characters and are of an expository nature. Isaac, Jacob, Balaam, Saul, Jonathan, Joab, Gehazi, Peter, Herod, Agrippa, are all dealt with, and also three women—Mary of Nazareth, Dorcas, and Mary of Bethany. Dr. Glaister has the power of making these men and women of the long ago living to-day and arresting in their message to us. Dr. Glaister's style is very clear and crisp, and he believes in the short sentence. We have quoted one of the sermons, in an abridged form, in 'The Christian Year.' It is not a character sketch, but deals with the subject of the manliness of Jesus.

Cardinal Mercier, by M. Georges Goyau (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net), is rather an enthusiastic appreciation than a biography. It gives, however, a brief outline of the Cardinal's career, and deals somewhat fully with his work in the University of Louvain and his heroic championship of Belgium in the dire years of the War. Perhaps the most beautiful passage in the book is his last letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury regarding the Conversations at Malines. It is a truly apostolic epistle, and reveals the writer as a prince of the Church and a great servant of Christ.

Think out your Faith, by the Rev. P. M. Rhinelander, D.D., D.C.L. (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net), contains six papers and addresses delivered at various times, but all dealing with the place and use of the creeds in the Christian Church. Bishop Rhinelander has the gift, which was possessed in so eminent a degree by William James, of getting past the names of things to the things themselves, and of making his readers think afresh about the meaning of familiar words. The treatment is popular in style, and forms an admirable model of the way in which instruction about the creeds can be given from the pulpit.

The Rev. W. Lockton, B.D., Vice-Principal and Lecturer in Mathematics at Winchester Diocesan Training College, recurs to his position, advocated in a recent essay, that there is an explanation of the origin of the Gospels quite apart from the popular Mark-Q hypothesis. In *The Three Traditions in the Gospels* (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net) he seeks to show, with elaborate care, that the four Gospels are derived ultimately from three different traditions, traceable respectively to the three Apostles, Peter, James, and John. Luke, which is represented as containing the most primitive evangelical tradition, is said to consist largely of material drawn from the Petrine and Jacobean traditions. Mark is also based upon the Petrine tradition, though also drawing upon the Jacobean and Johannine traditions. Matthew is largely a still further developed form of Mark, with additional material from the Jacobean tradition and other sources. The Fourth Gospel alone contains a simple tradition, that of John. This whole venturesome thesis is supported by discussions of selected passages, such as the anointing of Jesus, the institution of the Eucharist, the denials of Peter, and the trial and crucifixion of Jesus. The discussion would have had more value if Mr. Lockton had been able to relate it to recent source-criticism of the Gospels, especially to the Mark-Q hypothesis, not to say the Mark-Q hypothesis as supplemented by the recent Proto-Luke hypothesis.

Modernism and the Christian Church, by the Rev. F. Woodlock (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net), is

commended in a Foreword by G. K. Chesterton. It is a vigorous polemic, and an evangelical Protestant may find himself in agreement with many of the views expressed. The writer, however, draws his lines of demarcation very sharply, and holds, in short, that there is no tenable middle position between sceptical criticism and the orthodoxy of Rome.

Mr. Morris Morris, M.Sc., is no friend of Evolution as commonly understood. There are two ways, he tells us, of looking at the Doctrine of Descent—Evolution during Descent, and Creation during Descent. To Mr. Morris the former is anathema, as he believes it to run counter to research as well as to revelation; it is roundly denounced as atheistic and anti-Christian, and its supporters, generally speaking, as materialists. That is a hard saying, in view of the many able Christian defenders of the thesis denounced. Mr. Morris declines to regard 'Neanderthal Man' and his ilk as *man* at all; if we use that word in its proper sense, we shall have to admit, he agrees, that 'Man's antiquity cannot be shown to be greater than the Scriptures represent it to be': the species preceding him do not deserve to be called men. These arguments are developed by Mr. Morris in a book called *Man Created During Descent* (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d.). The writer is a trained geologist, but we fear that his arguments will carry little conviction to workers on the broader field of biology.

The more we know of the Hittites, the more we learn to realize their cultural importance. Nine years ago Dr. Cowley dealt in a course of Schweich Lectures with that somewhat elusive people, and in 1924 Dr. D. G. Hogarth in another Schweich course returned to the subject or at least to a fragment of it. These lectures have been published under the title *Kings of the Hittites* (Milford; 6s. net). The lecturer tells us that his purpose was to illustrate the civilization of those 'Kings of the Hittites' who were contemporary with the Hebrews of the Monarchy, and to try to discover their origin and racial character. In the face of greater powers and richer civilizations they developed a highly individual art and a wholly independent system of writing which maintained themselves for long. Nearly a third of the book is devoted to Carchemish, where, we are told, the use of the Hittite script, whether relieved or incised, had a life of about four centuries. The discussion is enlivened by numerous and admirably reproduced illustrations of things Hittite. Hittite culture was once supposed to be deep in the debt of Assyria; now, the independence of the former is more clearly recognized and even its influence on Assyria, and in the skilful hands of Dr. Hogarth, that vanished empire comes to life again.

The National Sunday School Union has issued two volumes of notes on the International Lessons for 1927. One is *The Concise Guide*, and is by Mr. Ernest H. Hayes. The other is *Notes on the Scripture Lessons for the Year 1927*, and is anonymous. Both are 3s. 6d. net. It is not necessary to do more than announce these books and commend them. They are up to date in their methods, well illustrated, fully alive to the need of bringing out the permanent meaning and bearing of Scripture, and altogether satisfactory as guides for teachers. A further, smaller volume deals with *The Morning Lessons for 1927*, and is published at 2s. 6d. net.

The Conferences on Christian Re-union held at Lambeth Palace from 1921 to 1925 attracted in a conspicuous degree the attention of the Christian world. A collection of all the relative documents up to date has now been issued under the title of *The Church of England and the Free Churches* (Oxford University Press; 2s. 6d. net). Beyond a brief introductory note, no narrative or comment is given. 'The object is simply to gather in a convenient form the present results of the Joint Conferences of Anglican and Free Church representatives.' It is published in the hope that it may lead to increased study of a great Christian problem which sooner or later must be solved if the Church is to fulfil the Divine ideal.

A series of beautifully got-up 'little books on religion' are issued by the Religious Tract Society. Principal Selbie of Mansfield College writes on *The Difference Christ Has Made* (in regard to God, to man, and to life). Principal Clow of Glasgow writes on *The Christian View of Death and Destiny*. Dr. J. A. Fleming's book is on *Evolution and Revelation*. One on *The Supper of the Lord* is from the pen of the late Bishop H. C. G. Moule. *Forgiving and Forgiven* is a study in human and Divine forgiveness by 'M. M. R.' *The Cross: Its Character and Consequences* is by the Rev. W. C. Procter, and *The Gamut of Graces* (a study of 2 P 1^{5-7}) is by the Rev. Dr. J. Monro Gibson. The prices range from 6d. to 2s. net.

Canon A. E. Barnes-Lawrence, having in a period of enforced leisure given fresh study to the subject of the Atonement, has issued his reflections in a dainty booklet, bearing the title *The Reconciliation* (R.T.S.; 6d. net). In his theology he follows Dr. Denney, and his writing is marked by an attractive simplicity and intense religious fervour.

The Son of Man and the Transfiguration, by the Rev. W. E. Evill, B.A. (Robert Scott; 1s. 6d. net), is an arresting study. The writer complains with some reason that commentators generally have done little to explain the place and purpose of the Transfiguration in the life of Jesus. To many there appears to be no special reason why it should have happened at all. Dissatisfied with this state of things, the writer has worked out a theory which he acknowledges is based on some hints in Godet. Briefly it is this, that the Transfiguration was the culmination of the sinless life of Jesus, that death was not His due, but that, there and then, He would have entered His glory had He not, of His own free will, turned back, as from heaven's opening gate, and chosen the way of the Cross. This accords with the fact that immediately after the Transfiguration He teaches the necessity of His death, and it emphasizes in a striking way the voluntariness of that death. The treatment of this high theme is scholarly and reverent, and the writer's theory, whether accepted or not, will be found full of suggestion.

A separate edition of Tertullian's *De Oratione* is very welcome, and we are indebted for it to the Rev. R. W. Muncey, M.A.—*Q. Septimi Florentis Tertulliani de Oratione* (Scott; 10s. 6d. net). This work is of peculiar interest and value not only as coming from the 'father of Latin theology' but as containing, besides a discussion of rules for prayer in general and of contemporary liturgical practices, the earliest extant exposition of the Lord's Prayer. Mr. Muncey has done for his text everything that may be expected of an editor, and he has done it with care and competence. In the Introduction there is a table of Tertullian's Scriptural quotations in the *De Oratione* which should be helpful towards a final theory of Tertullian's use of the current Latin texts. The text of the *De Oratione* adopted by Mr. Muncey is that of Reifferscheid and Wissowa in 'Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum,' vol. xx. (Vienna, 1890); but some of the more important variants are recorded in the footnotes. The volume is also supplied with ample expository and illustrative notes, and it concludes with a chapter on the Liturgy of the North African Church, embodying the most important passages of Tertullian's writings bearing on this subject. Alongside of Mr. Muncey's text of this most difficult of Latin prose writers the younger student might well set Professor Souter's volume containing a translation of the *De Oratione*—a volume of which Mr. Muncey has evidently made full use.

Another book on preaching, but one with a most disarming, and even touching, preface. The writer quotes a letter received from one who aspires to be a lay preacher and who asks in humble earnestness how to begin. This book, *First Steps in Preaching*, by Mr. J. A. Clapperton, M.A. (Sharp; 2s. 6d. net), is written in answer to that letter, and it is a capital answer, plain, direct, simple, and full of sound sense. The reading of it could not fail to be helpful to young speakers, and even the theological student and the ordained preacher may find its pages full of suggestion.

An important part of a clergyman's duty is the preparation of candidates for Holy Communion, and there are all sorts of questions to be decided in this connexion. At what age should a young person be encouraged to communicate? How long should the preparation occupy? A few weeks, or six months? And what subjects should be included? Ought there to be a careful instruction in Christian doctrine, or only a direct instruction about the Holy Supper? All these questions hang together and depend on one another. And the guidance on such questions which an experienced clergyman can give is invaluable. Such guidance will be found, admirably expressed, in *The Increase of the Holy Spirit: A Method of Preparation for Confirmation and First Communion*, by the Rev. F. A. Lee, M.A. (Skeffington; 2s. 6d. net). 'What I think we have to do,' the writer says, 'is to try and get our candidates to understand what our religion is about, what it will do for us, and how we are to practise it. The pages which follow are an attempt to do that.' These pages will help just where help is needed, and not least in regard to the difficult matter of personal dealing. The value of the book is increased by the unconventional style in which its counsels are conveyed.

Everywhere Bunyan, designated by Mr. Rudyard Kipling as

> The father of the Novel,
> Salvation's first Defoe,

is known and read. But it is by the 'Pilgrim's Progress' much more than *The Holy War*. In the hope that *The Holy War* will come to its own, Dr. William H. Draper, Master of the Temple, has prepared an abridged edition prefaced by an excellent introduction. It is the anti-climax in the middle of *The Holy War* that has detracted from its popularity Dr. Draper thinks. With Emmanuel in possession and Diabolus banished to the parched places, the writer feels that the war is over. And then it seems to begin again with the statement—'But there was a man in the town of Mansoul, and his name was Mr. Carnal-Security.' The contrivance of Dr. Draper's edition is so to shorten the text, without otherwise changing it, as to bring the real end of the Holy War of Mansoul more quickly into sight. This edition, with its scholarly introduction, with illustrations also, with its clear printing and good binding, is published by the S.P.C.K. for 3s. 6d. net.

'The central secret of all our modern social and economic confusion is that we have overlooked the importance of dogmatic definitions of man, and of the fundamental nature of his fellowship. Plato, St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, would have considered it futile to discuss questions of sociology without first having settled what was meant by society. And in order to settle that they would have inquired as to the purpose of society. They would have said that this raised the whole problem of man's nature, and they would have plunged boldly into a consideration of the relation between man's existence and Ultimate Reality.' In *Christian Faith and Social Order*, by Mr. W. G. Peck (S.C.M.; 1s. net), we are offered a survey of those considerations in regard to man's nature and his relation to God which are commonly overlooked by the social reformer. This book is a compressed version of 'The Divine Society,' a larger work by the same writer. The argument, though compressed, is clear and forcibly put. It amounts to a plea for the application of Christian principles to social problems.

Theology and the Modern Man, by Principal W. B. Selbie, D.D. (S.C.M.; 1s. 6d. net), is spoken of by the writer as a series of 'brief and untechnical discussions of a few of the great themes of the Christian faith.' These are the Christian Idea of God, the Trinity, the Fact of Christ, Sin, Salvation, and Eternal Life. Principal Selbie writes out of the fullness of his knowledge, and expresses in simple language and with quiet assurance the settled convictions of Christian faith. It may be questioned if there is much here to convince a mind seriously troubled with doubts, but there must be many to whom a fresh statement of the fundamentals in the language of to-day will be very welcome.

The Church is fortunate in having in its foreign service many able men. And one of them is Dr. P. J. Maclagan, formerly of Swatow, and now Foreign Missions Secretary of the English Presbyterian Church. Probably he resents that phrase 'foreign service.' For does he not dedicate his excellent book *Chinese Religious Ideas* (S.C.M.; 6s. net)—to old colleagues 'Chinese and Foreign'? And that is characteristic of his mind. One wishes that people who talk foolishly about the overbearing truculence of missionaries could be induced to read this work—all of it, but especially that chapter where, unconsciously, the author lets us see the methods he used. The perfect courtesy, the eagerness of appreciation, the humility that quite frankly seeks to learn as well as teach, the wisdom with which the uniqueness of Christ is laid before these new minds, leaving them free to think Him out for themselves, and along the lines of their own mental development—all that is a fine answer to much silly gabble.

But one fears these stupid people will not read it. For Dr. Maclagan asks some serious attention from his readers. He is indeed astonishingly lucid in his handling of his themes. There are not many things more difficult than to understand Taoism, except to put into words what you think you do understand about it. Yet the chapter upon that is clear and masterly. The treatment of Confucius, of Mencius, of Chu Hsi, whom he calls the St. Thomas Aquinas of Confucianism, of that fascinating mind the philosopher Wang, and not least of the old religion that circled round Shang-ti, is marked not only by the knowledge we expect but by warm if discriminating sympathy and real philosophic grasp. For Buddhism, evidently, he does not greatly care; partly perhaps because of difficulties he feels have been introduced into the Chinese Christian Church by the use of Buddhist words that seem to him to blur things not a little. There, where the sympathy is least, the knowledge also seems least perfect.

It was a fine idea to choose Dr. Maclagan for the Duff Lectureship, and it is very well that he has now given his studies to a wider audience.

The Rev. Hugh Martin, the well-known literary

secretary of the Student Christian Movement, has tackled a difficult subject in *Christ and Money* (S.C.M.; 3s. net), but he handles it with courage and with full knowledge. There is a good chapter on our Lord's teaching, and one on the rights of property, and the writer does not shirk the application of his principles to the most corrupt kind of practice. His chapter on personal expenditure includes recreation, rates and taxes, saving and investment, gambling and giving. Money is a means, not an end; but the real question is, a means to what? That may be said to be the central point of the book. The social theory underlying the whole treatment is 'advanced,' but there is a great deal of sound sense as well as information in the book, and readers who are not as radical in their social views as Mr. Martin will learn wisdom on many points from his pages. There are, of course, doubtful points in the argument. The delusive simplicity of the case against gambling, on p. 97, will not convince any one who has really thought out the subject. That, however, is a subsidiary matter, and the worth of this sincere essay is not seriously lessened by the queries one is inclined sometimes to put against some of its statements.

The Student Christian Movement has published in paper covers at 2s. net a number of direct and unconventional letters of a young medical missionary in China to a colleague at home. The title is *What It Feels Like.* The author hides his identity under the name of 'Doctor Robin,' but there is an introduction by Sir Humphrey Rolleston, from which we learn that he was at Oxford under Sir William Osler and was regarded by him as one of his best and most original students. Any one who reads these letters will no longer have any doubt as to the varied opportunities that a medical missionary in China has, or as to the romance of the life.

Does any average newspaper reader know what is happening in China? Dimly, as through a heavy haze, we see masses of men marched to and fro. Leaders, with alien uncouth-sounding names, appear and disappear. But that is all. We feel, indeed, that the giant has grown restless, and is turning in his sleep, seems wakening. And, if he does, interesting things are bound to happen. But it is all disconcertingly blurred and vague. The Student Christian Movement is, accordingly, on the spot when it publishes *China To-Day through Chinese Eyes* (2nd ser., 2s. 6d. net). Here at least we have what seven Chinese gentlemen feel about the problems of their land, though how far they represent the other odd four hundred millions we have no means of knowing. But the seven, who are distinguished men in Christian circles, have alert and interesting and broad minds. They know a vast deal more about it than we do; and their views upon the political, industrial, intellectual, and religious movements in their country, if briefly stated, are fresh and arresting. Quite evidently the giant is awake at last. What will he do with his strength? One gathers that Chinese Christians are faced by an extraordinarily difficult situation. If they follow these seven, they will meet it with wisdom and courage.

Present-Day Faiths.

The Society of Friends and its Contribution to the Life of the Church.

By Edward Grubb, M.A., Letchworth.

The very welcome invitation given me by the Editor to write something on this subject is a cheering indication of the change that has come over Christian minds since the seventeenth century —when one of the mildest epithets applied by their opponents to the Quakers was 'vermin,' and when so saintly a man as Richard Baxter could write, in his *Quaker's Catechism,* 'Was there ever a generation of men on whom the image of the Devil was more visible than on these [Quakers]?' I am afraid that, yielding to current methods of religious controversy, my spiritual ancestors sometimes gave back as good as they got. Both sides were perhaps too much like the Scotsman who agreed that 'without controversy great is the mystery of godliness,' but thought that *with controversy* it was all plain

sailing. There was no doubt a real foundation for the common charge that the Quakers were exclusive and arrogant, claiming that they alone had possession of the truth, and that all others were 'in the black night of apostasy.' But there is another side to this: here and there in the early Quaker writings you will find passages that breathe the spirit of unity with true Christians whatever label they bear. 'The humble, meek, merciful, just, pious and devout souls are everywhere of one religion'—so wrote William Penn in his *Fruits of Solitude*—'and when Death has taken off the mask they will know one another, though the divers liveries they wear here makes them strangers.' Nearly a century later John Woolman, the apostle of the American movement against slavery, recorded in his Journal his surprise and satisfaction, on reading the *Imitation*, at finding that Thomas à Kempis, though a Roman Catholic, was a truly devout Christian.

Perhaps one of the best contributions we can make to the life of the Church at the present time is along these lines: to prove, if we can, that, as Thomas Story wrote in 1737, 'The unity of Christians never did nor ever will or can stand in uniformity of thought or opinion, but in Christian love only.' 'Faith' to us is not a body of beliefs or a surrender to the authority of the Church, but an attitude of the inner man to the God revealed in Jesus Christ. In a document on *The True Basis of Christian Unity*, approved by the London Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends in 1917, it is stated that

> 'We conceive of Christianity not as a collection of "notions" or doctrines, and a number of traditional observances; but as essentially an experience, and a way of life based on that experience. Christian Unity for us consists, not in agreement in ideas and practices, but in a common Christian experience, apart from which neither doctrines nor practices appear to us to have meaning or value. . . . Unity consists in the One Divine Life that is reproducing in men the character of the historic Person, Jesus Christ; which, while it is something far deeper than any definition of His person, is for Christians the final manifestation of the character of God Himself. "The glory which Thou hast given Me I have given them, that they all may be one."'

From this point of view, Paul's simile of the body and the members may be extended from individual Christians to the various groups in which they are found: each has its contribution to make to the life of the whole, and none can say to another, 'I have no need of thee.'

The Society of Friends in Great Britain is one of the smallest of organized religious bodies, containing only some 20,000 members, of whom very few are found in Scotland or Wales. In Ireland there are about 2000, mostly centred round Dublin and Belfast. In America there are perhaps 120,000, but divided into several branches, of which the largest has to some extent assimilated its methods of worship to those of other 'Nonconformist' sects. In large parts of England it is almost unknown, and where this is not the case it is in general reputed to be 'straight' and often very successful in business[1]; to have a *flair* for philanthropy, as in the matter of slavery; to object on principle to war, and to have a gift for the relief of distress when this occurs on a large scale in any part of the world. It is also known to make large use of silence in worship, in which it has no appointed ministry, no recital of creeds, no singing of hymns, and no observance of sacramental rites. But few Christians who observe these peculiar ways of conducting worship have any clear idea of the source from which they arise, or of their relation to philanthropic and other efforts for the good of humanity.

For a real understanding of the contribution which the Society of Friends would like to make to the life of the Church at large, it is, I think, essential to get behind the outward form (or disuse of form) to the central experience and conception of religion on which it rests. This is known as the principle of the 'Inward Light,' by which the Quakers profess to be guided—in common perhaps with Mystics at all periods of Church history, from Paul and 'John' downwards. Belief in the Light was not a doctrine or theory accepted from tradition or even from a past revelation; it was the direct outcome of personal religious experience. George Fox himself, and others either before or after they met him, had turned from human teachers to an inward Source of what they believed to be direct revelation.

> 'These things,' says Fox, 'I did not see by the help of man, nor by the letter, though

[1] Some years ago, on a steamer bound for New York, I sat at table by the side of a merchant who had lived for twenty years in America and was returning from a visit to England. I remarked that I supposed he found the standard of business integrity in America hardly equal to that prevailing in England. 'It is so,' he replied, 'unless you happen to come across Quakers.' I did not inform him that I was one.

they are written in the letter, but I saw them in the light of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by the immediate Spirit and power, as did the holy men of God by whom the holy Scriptures were written. Yet I had no slight esteem of the holy Scriptures, but they were very precious to me, for I was in that Spirit by which they were given forth; and what the Lord opened in me I afterwards found was agreeable to them.' [1]

Fox here claims that he is in the true line of succession from prophets and apostles, that the day of revelation has never ceased, that the Spirit of God is as near to men to-day as ever it was in the past. But he makes no *exclusive* claim; inspiration, he thinks, may be known by every sincere Christian, and indeed in measure by every man who will wait for it, attend to it, and obey it. His central interest, like that of the Hebrew prophets, was not theology, but the bringing of human life into conformity with the mind and will of God. As I have written elsewhere:

'We might perhaps without serious inaccuracy describe Quakerism as a recovery of Hebrew prophetism, reinforced by the Christian mysticism of Paul and "John," and enlarged by their universalism. It was, of course, no mere reaction to Hebraic modes of life and thought. Its evangelical note is strong and clear; and this, I believe, is due to the fact that George Fox and his friends, like the early Christians before them, identified the Light which had arisen in their souls with the living Spirit of Jesus Christ their Master. It was this that supplied them with the antidote against "Ranterism." The living Spirit of Jesus, reproduced in them, provided at once a definite moral standard and the inward motive for striving after it. They were never unwilling to reply to the many attacks on their Christianity by setting down, as occasion required, their Christian beliefs; and these statements (with the exception of a formulated doctrine of the Trinity) usually ran on quite orthodox lines. But if anyone began, as George Keith did about the time of Fox's death, to make such statements the *essence* of Christianity, he was described as having "run out into notions," because he seemed to be making Christianity an intellectual or dogmatic system and not a new spiritual life.' [2]

[1] *Journal*, i. 36.
[2] *Quaker Thought and History*, p. 27.

Whatever we may think of the claim that every man is (or may be, consciously or unconsciously) inspired in measure by the living Spirit of Christ, it was this undoubtedly that made the Quakers what they were in the seventeenth century and what they have been since. Quite obviously it lay at the root of their method of worship. All that was needed, they believed, in the way of human organization was to fix a time and place for meeting together. When so assembled, in waiting fellowship before God, His Spirit would guide the proceedings in so far as human wills were brought into subjection to Him. There could be no distinction of clergy and laity, 'no male and female' even, where all were to be direct recipients of the Spirit's life. Silence was not to be an end in itself, but a means to the end of giving the Spirit freedom to rule and guide. The non-observance of outward rites was not a mere negation; the symbol was felt to be needless when the reality was actually experienced. The affirmation that Jesus never intended to institute ceremonies was a product of insight into the inwardness and spirituality of His religion; but it is confirmed by modern critical study of the New Testament, of which the early Friends knew nothing.

All true Christians recognize, of course, in varying degrees, the guidance of the Spirit. The Quakers simply trusted it further than most Christians have been prepared to do. Not only their meetings for worship, but their whole Church polity, was placed under Divine control. Individualists as they were, they recognized corporate as well as personal guidance. Every member of the body has an equal voice in every Church meeting he or she chooses to attend; and in this country, so far as I am aware, no vote has ever been taken at such meetings. They are gathered in a spirit of worship, and after a time of silent waiting the 'Clerk,' who is both chairman and secretary, introduces to the meeting the matters that need consideration. These are severally discussed, and the Clerk prepares a minute in regard to each which he (or she) feels to express the 'sense of the meeting.' This is very rarely challenged, but it is often modified to embody more accurately what the meeting desires. If (as sometimes happens) the gathering appears to be almost equally divided, it is not unusual for the Clerk or some one else to ask for a period of silent or vocal prayer for guidance. Frequently some solution to the problem is discovered; if not, and if there is no clear sense of the meeting, the matter is left undecided or deferred till further light comes. In this way party spirit is almost wholly

avoided; those who have not got what they desired usually acquiesce loyally in the decision of the meeting.[1] The method may appear slow and cumbrous, but it works to general satisfaction.

The principle of the Light in the souls of men also lay at the root of the Quaker attitude to moral and social questions. 'Walking in the Light' meant reality, truthfulness, simplicity, and sincerity. Hence the demand for uprightness in business dealings—which very early expressed itself in the fact that the Quakers were the first to place a definite price on goods offered for sale in shops.[2] It was this also, taken with a clear injunction in the Sermon on the Mount, that led to the refusal of judicial oaths—a 'testimony' which in the seventeenth century sometimes brought terrible consequences. When all other charges failed, recourse was had by unscrupulous judges to the Oath of Allegiance, which it was well known a Quaker, though perfectly loyal, would not take. Refusal might involve long imprisonment, with the confiscation of property. The Quakers would not use a form of speech which implied that their bare word was not enough.

It was the conviction that the Light of Christ shone, potentially at least, in the souls of all men that made the Quakers ardent reformers. It reinforced the sense of the inherent worth of all manhood which humanity owes most of all to Jesus Christ, slow as His followers have often been in understanding its applications. Injustice and oppression, such as that involved in slavery, degraded human personality and must be removed. The Society of Friends in America, thanks mainly to the labours of Woolman, has the honour of having been the first Christian body in that country to make the practice of slaveholding incompatible with membership.

Little as this has been understood, it is the principle of the Inward Light that explains our protest against war—a protest upheld by Friends from the first, in common with many of the Mystics who had preceded them. Belief in universal Light carried the assurance that all men were brothers, and no one who held it with conviction could consent to kill another man even in what was held to be a righteous cause. Also the Light was felt to be the Light of *Christ*, who was seeking to reproduce in His followers His own character and way of life. As He overcame evil, not by force but by the way of the Cross, so must they. And, further, 'walking in the Light' meant obedience *to Christ alone*, with which military discipline, involving as it necessarily does unqualified obedience to human orders, was felt to be incompatible.

But the Friends have never been contented with a mere refusal to take part in war. They have felt that an essential part of their 'testimony' is to do their utmost to take away the causes that lead to war, by the advocacy of justice and goodwill to the people of other nations; in the conviction that in the steady practice of justice to all is to be found the true and sufficient defence of their own country.[3] When wars have occurred, they have come forward for the relief of the suffering war has brought, especially on the non-combatant population, friends and foes alike. I think that one of the chief contributions we have to make to the conduct of human life is in the assurance that a nation which consistently stands for justice to all, and is prepared to make sacrifices for this end, need never fear attack. It appears to me that this belief is not superstition but common sense; and that it ought always to have been adopted and proclaimed by Christian teachers as affirming the only true way of life.

There is, I believe, a very close connexion between the two main applications mentioned above of the central principle of the Inward Light—first to the life of worship, and second to the service of humanity. Whatever gifts may have come to the Society of Friends for ministering to the needs and sorrows of mankind are attributable, in my own judgment, in the main to the training its members have received in their quiet meetings for worship. They have deliberately forgone the aid to the religious life which many undoubtedly derive from ritual and sacrament, and have been compelled to find for themselves a Divine 'strength made perfect in weakness.' Their spiritual muscles have been strengthened by exercise. Severe, no doubt, is the discipline of free worship in the atmosphere of

[1] I remember a gathering of over one thousand men and women at London Yearly Meeting, when feeling was acutely divergent concerning a proposed declaration of belief, which many feared was nothing else than the attempt to impose a creed. The matter was debated for a whole day; no bitter word was spoken from first to last; and the proposal, though supported by many leading Friends, was negatived, in opposition to the view of the Clerk himself.

[2] For proofs of this statement see Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*, pp. 152, 211, 523.

[3] The classical example of success on these lines is Penn's treaty with the Indians. For the seventy years during which the government of Pennsylvania adhered to the spirit of the treaty the Colony was never attacked by Indians, though wholly without armed defence against them.

silence, for those who take seriously the task of finding, for themselves and the gathered company, the reality of the Spirit's guidance; but in spite of many failures it is often manifestly found. In the fellowship of silence before God strength is received and accumulated to 'take the common things of life and walk truly among them.'

'To each one,' wrote the Apostle Paul, 'is given a manifestation of the Spirit for the common good.' It is only with that thought in mind, applied to corporate as well as individual members of the Christian Church, that I have felt justified in writing of any 'contribution' that the Society of Friends may have to offer to the Church's life. Recognizing our weakness in intellect and in numbers, our inability to win more than a tiny fraction of the number of real Christians to our particular ways of thought and life, our frequent failure to live up to our own ideals, I ought rather to be seeking help from others than trying to offer it. Yet I am sure that good will result from the Editor's endeavour to extract from representatives of the different Christian communions a summary of what they feel they want to say; and perhaps no one can really do it except from the inside of each body. Briefly, then, and in all humility, I would summarize thus what I take to be the Quaker contribution to our common life.[1]

(1) We feel that Christianity is essentially the Religion of the Spirit; that the final seat of authority is God indwelling in the soul of man; that the outward authorities of Church and Bible, and most of all of Jesus Christ Himself, take their right place as they are accepted on the testimony of the Inward Witness that convinces of truth and goodness; that this Inward Guide is to be trusted with the preservation of order and unity and edification in the Church.

(2) We desire to offer evidences that a Christian Society can be maintained in life and fruitfulness with a minimum of human organization, and without the outward helps of an appointed ministry and sacramental rites; that a purely lay ministry, including that of women, if it genuinely seeks for the 'anointing' of the Spirit, can supply the religious needs of such a body.

(3) We wish to call the attention of our fellow-Christians to the strength and fruitfulness of silent waiting on God, in fellowship with one another; and to suggest that it would be well if this always found a place in the public worship of God.

(4) We feel that the most urgent need of the modern world is that Christians should be convinced that Jesus Christ is the Lord of *all* our life; that He understood and understands the problems of social and international relations; that His way of 'overcoming evil with good' is a safe and practicable method, and the only one that can now save humanity from self-destruction by war; and that Christians can only play their true part in His world if they are willing to understand and follow Him at all costs.

(5) We believe, as stated at the beginning of this paper, that we have something to offer towards Christian reunion, in urging that this must be sought on the basis of loyalty to Christ and manifestation of His life, and not on that of creeds and sacraments. It appears to us that we can do more to further the cause of true unity by adhering faithfully to what we believe has been revealed to us as to the non-necessity of outward forms for the Christian than we could by surrendering our 'testimony' for the sake of a superficial uniformity. In pleading that a place must be found in any reunited Church for Christians who, through what seems to them loyalty to Christ, are not baptized with water and abstain from the outward Communion, we are erecting no barrier but seeking to prevent the erection of one that we believe our Master would not approve; just as Paul prevented the barrier of circumcision being imposed on the early Church. For 'where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.'

[1] In what follows I am not committing any one else, but only stating what I myself believe the Society of Friends to stand for.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Eyes and No Eyes.[1]

'Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things.'—Ps 119[18].

The other day I was walking down a dingy street with nothing to see but the dust blowing along the road, and some puddles, and the bare dead walls, and a few frowsy people shouting at each other from high windows, and there was not a touch of colour or of greenness; no flowers, never a tree, nor even a glimpse of grass. And, 'What a dreadful street!' I said. 'However do they manage to live here, with nothing to see, and nothing to do, and nothing to interest one in any way?'

And just then, round the corner came a motor lorry. There was a man driving it, of course. But there was nothing in the lorry but a dog—a spaniel, which had it all to itself. And never have I seen a dog so happy and excited. It was frantic with happiness. It kept rushing from one side to the other, and turning round and round till it ought to have been giddy. And all the time it was barking in a kind of bewildered rapture.

'Isn't life just bully?' it kept saying. 'And in all your life did you ever see a street anything like as exciting as this street?' At least it tried to tell us that a hundred times. But it never got it finished. For always it caught sight of something else, and just had to run and have a look at it. Now it was at one side barking eagerly. 'A boy! a nice-looking boy! I could do with a romp with him!' And before it could say that, it was off to the other side. 'A man with a bag! Now what can he have in that? I would love to nose at it and find out all about it.' But by that time he was at the back of the lorry, all trembling and shouting his hardest, 'What's that? A cat! Two cats, no less! And if only this thing would stop, I could catch them easy!' Yet before you could think he was off again and near the front. 'A gentlemanly looking dog, that! I would enjoy a stroll with him. Isn't this street simply great? It's so full of lovely things!' And round and round he went, flopping his great ears and barking, till the lorry turned a corner, and he was gone.

And do you know, when I looked round, the dog was right. It wasn't such a bad street after all; and not nearly so empty as I had thought. There *was* a boy, a nice-looking chap; and there was a man with a bag; and there were two cats, though I don't think the dog would have got them so easily as he made out; and there was a dog, though I hadn't noticed him. The street was really quite a good street, I saw now.

And you and I had better think about that. You haven't got everything you want—nobody has; and perhaps you are a bit sulky and peevish and cross about it, and go whining round asking Why? Some one else has got off Maths, why can't I? Some other fellow's father has a car, why can't we have one too? Some girl you know hasn't to go to Sunday school, why must you?

And you feel quite ill-used and dreadfully sorry for yourself. It isn't fair that you have to live in such a dull street and have such a stupid life!

Don't you be silly! What you need is something or some one to open your eyes to see all that is there, as the dog opened mine. And if nothing else can do it, you ask God to do it for you. And He will.

Why! think of all the glorious things you have. There's Mother, that's pretty good for a start; and home, and you wouldn't have any other; and Dad, and he isn't bad, though he does growl sometimes, and puts down his paper and sends you off to bed, and there's no wheedling him as you can do with Mother. And there are your books, and your cycle, and your friends, and your school. You might have been sent to that other one! The fellows there were sent to it, poor chaps! And—— We're only at the beginning. But we'll have to stop, or else you'll be running about the church flopping your ears, and shouting, 'Don't listen to that dull man in the pulpit! Listen to me and I'll tell you what a glorious life I have.' But you can't do that, you know. I wouldn't mind, I think it would do us more good than a sermon. But the elders wouldn't like it. So you had better sit still. But, if I were you, all through the long dull sermon I would think out all the lovely things you have, and snuggle close to God, and thank Him for them, that He's given you so jolly a life; and tell Him that you're never going to be cross and peevish any more.

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

The Sin of minding One's own Business.[1]

'Not looking each of you to his own things, but each of you also to the things of others.'—Ph 2[4].

What strange things many of our old proverbs and sayings are, with wisdom in them, to be sure,

[1] By the Reverend R. Strong, M.A., B.Litt., Norwich.

or how could they have managed to live such a long time? But so many of them are only half the truth, and some of them, which sound very imposing, as if they were all the truth, need to be watched with special care, or they may sometimes trick us, and lead us into very dangerous places. That is why we have so often had to make another proverb to supply what was lacking in the other. For the whole truth we need not only 'Fine feathers make fine birds,' but also 'Handsome is that handsome does.'

What a pompous, big-voiced fellow is this—'Mind your own business.' He seems to be saying, 'Listen to me! I am the one to be listened to. All the truth about this business of life is with me. This is the secret. Mind your own business!' Sometimes we are inclined to think that this saying is as true as it sounds. That is specially so, if somebody else has just been getting in your way, and has succeeded in making ever so much unnecessary difficulty, which is the sort of happening that does upset one's temper. If ever this has been your fate, I can hear you saying, 'Yes, that's right! I don't like those who are always getting in the way of my work, messing up my experiments in the lab., flinging about advice on the cricket or football field, when we know quite well what we want to do, and are doing it for all we are worth. Let everybody look after his own affairs.' Then, when we have said all this, there comes this very plain word of St. Paul about minding the business of other people. What can it all mean? Evidently there is something more to be said.

Have you ever noticed that all the folk who have managed to do really fine deeds in the world, deeds which stir the blood and make you glad to be alive so that you also may have your chance of heroism and fidelity, never seem to have narrowed their lives in this way, but often enough spent their time, and often, indeed, risked their lives in carrying out Paul's advice. All this talk about minding one's own business would simply be dismissed as rubbish by those who have done things in the world worth talking about. What would Shackleton have said about it? Well, one may guess that easily. Do you know the story that Wild tells about him? Wild had been down with dysentery, couldn't eat the horseflesh, and naturally was suffering from hunger. At breakfast-time each got a biscuit, which they could eat when they liked. On 31st January Wild finished his at once, and as he was starting on the march he found Shackleton's hand slipping a biscuit into his pocket.

'What's that, Boss?' he asked.

'Your need is greater than mine.'

Shackleton was irresistible and fought in silence with his own hunger, for he knew his friend was more hardly put to it than himself. Are you much surprised that Wild put this entry in his diary: 'Shackleton privately forced on me his own breakfast-biscuit, and would have given me another tonight had I allowed him. I do not suppose that any one else in the world can thoroughly realize how much generosity and sympathy were shown by this.' Yes, the really splendid things are just like that, Shackleton caring a great deal more about Wild's business than about his own.

Especially in these days, when the interests of all the nations are getting linked together still more closely, Paul's word is a very important one. We have all to take a place in a great fellowship, and think still more seriously about that fellowship. How can anybody talk about minding his own business as if it were as easy as all that? What's the use, for example, of somebody in Lancashire thinking only about Lancashire, when his bread and butter may depend on what people are thinking and doing in America or Egypt or India? The great world, which you younger folk in particular must seek to create, is just a world in which men have learned to think in terms not of themselves, but of the fellowship.

Nobody wants merely fussy people, and Paul was not advising his friends to become like that. You will never be stupid and simply interfering if you will read on and see the splendid picture that is given here. Stirring men to humility and service, Paul tried to help them by a picture, and such a picture! 'Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus.' That mind will crowd out selfishness and bring in humility. With that mind you can fling yourself into service for others and not be afraid.

Living Words.[1]

'The word was made flesh.'—Jn 1^{14}.

'The Word was made Flesh.' How can a word be made 'Flesh'?

It seems a difficult thing to understand. Many people think it is a strange mystery which has to do with Jesus only, and that there is nothing like

[1] S. Robertson, *Balanced Burdens*, 103.

it anywhere outside the Gospels and the story of Jesus, and many don't try to understand it at all.

I want to help you to understand it, and so I want to show you that a word becoming flesh is a very common thing.

First, let us go among books.

When Hamlet was reading once he was asked, 'What are you reading?' He said, 'Words, words, words.'

Well, some books are only 'words, words, words,' but some are more: they are words that live. The spirit of the writer has breathed on the words and they have 'become Flesh,' so that we talk and think about the characters as if they were real living people.

When Dickens wants to show us brave unselfishness he paints little Nell, and in little Nell these words come to life and we love them; when, in the book, little Nell dies, Dickens wept, and thousands since then have shed tears over the brave child's death. She was only 'words' in a book. Yes! but the words were living words.

At Aberfoyle there is hanging on a tree outside the town, the coulter of the plough with which Bailie Nicol Jarvie in *Rob Roy* fought the Highlanders and singed their plaids. There never was any such person. He was only 'words,' but Sir Walter Scott's genius made the words live, so that Jeanie Deans and Bailie Nicol Jarvie and the Antiquary are our friends.

So the Bible, instead of talking about 'Faith,' shows us Abraham going out at God's command 'not knowing whither he went,' and that makes us understand better than the word would. It shows us Jesus weeping at Lazarus' grave, and that makes us understand what 'Sympathy' means better than long explanations of the word could do. It shows us Christ on the Cross, and that makes us feel what 'Sacrifice' means.

If we go out of the world of books into the world of Life, we find that words have power upon us when they take a body and 'become flesh.' They have no power while they are only words. 'Patriotism' is a word only, but when it took a beautiful body and clothed itself in heather hills, and snow-tipped mountains jewelled with lakes, and hung with silver rivers and garlanded with the sea, it had power to call thousands of Scottish lads from their homes to go out and suffer and die for Scotland in the war.

When it clothed itself with the beautiful fields of England, when it came to earth and wore on its bosom England's moors and downs and quiet villages, it had power to call the English men to go out on the same great adventure.

It was a word made flesh.

'Love' is just four letters, two consonants and two vowels, and has no power to make our life noble and unselfish until the word has become 'somebody'; somebody that loves us, and that we love. 'Love' for you means 'Father and Mother'; 'Love' for them means 'You.'

Now the Bible tells us 'God is Love'—that He loves us; but that is not easy to understand. It isn't really true while it is only a word.

So God made that word 'Flesh' so that we couldn't help understanding and so that it should be a mighty word to us. He sent Jesus to earth, and Jesus was God's Love become a Person. It was the word become Flesh. If you want to be sure that God is Love, look at Jesus. If you want to know how God loves, look at Jesus.

A little girl was being put to bed by her mother, and, as she turned out the light to go away, the little girl asked her to stay with her. 'No,' she said, 'you've got your dolly and you've got your Teddy-bear.' 'I don't want Dolly,' she said, 'and I don't want Teddy. I want some one *with skin on their face*!'

The world was once like that little girl. It was afraid in the dark and wanted to be sure of its Father's Love. It wanted more than words. It wanted living Truth and living Love, and so God made these words Flesh. Jesus came, not to talk about Truth and Love, but to be Himself Truth and Love.

And the end of it all is, that Christ's words must become Flesh in us. What He said is not just to be listened to, it is to be lived. Faith and sacrifice, kindness and sympathy, are words that must become Flesh in the lives of Christian folk.

God's word became Flesh in Jesus: His words must become Flesh in you and me.

The Christian Year.

Septuagesima Sunday.

Elim.

'They came to Elim.'—Ex 15^{27}.

Elim was God's kindness to Israel, but not a whit less blessedly it is God's kindness to us, if we declare plainly that we seek a country and are travellers along the road of the pilgrims. Let that be our interpretation to-day. Let Elim represent the spiritual experience, the seasonable help, the sweet and strong consolation, by which our Father

and our Lord meets our chronic and our critical needs, as we journey towards the inheritance He has prepared for those who love Him.

1. The first thing to be said is this, that *Elim is provided for those who have been through the Exodus.* It is God's restoration of the tired; but there was a solemnity, a miracle, a gift of gifts, which preceded the restoration, and which was even more astonishing—there was His enfranchisement of the enslaved. The Israelites were bondmen in the land of Egypt, and the Lord their God redeemed them.

Behind our Elims lies a grace more extraordinary, a power more divine, an Exodus infinitely more to be desired. We were bondmen, under the yoke of sin and of death, which is sin's issue and wage. We could neither discover nor yet create an outgate for ourselves. But One who is without spot and blemish offered Himself to be our Paschal Lamb. He was both Priest and Victim. Thus it was that after hopeless slavery we rose up free. And now there is no reviving or invigorating Elim to which we may not look forward. For He who spared not His own true Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him freely give us all things?

It is not that God's bounties only begin after we have made acquaintance with the crowning mercy of the Exodus. He has many compassions, many thoughts of peace, many awakening and tender providences, many movements and ministries of His Spirit, for men who linger still in the house of bondage. But Elim is different. It is, plainly, the property of pilgrim souls.

2. *Elim is the compensation and the cure for Marah.* Human nature cannot sustain the intensest emotions long. They exhaust us. They provoke a reaction by and by. And when in the reaction there comes some pressure of necessity, some burden of care, some heaviness and soreness of trial, we are too apt to lose heart, to abandon hope, to sink into black despondency as the men of Israel did. Marah has had its repetitions a thousand times, and in a thousand redeemed souls. Yet it never is justifiable and right. The sin of Marah is the sin of the forgetful mind. Too soon we have grown oblivious of the transcendent love and liberation of the Exodus. Too soon we have ceased to remember Calvary. And the sin of Marah is the sin of the distrustful spirit. The trouble is a thing appointed for us. In this new emergency we shall have to face once more our own insufficiency; but, over against that, there should shine forth, calmly and convincingly, His all-sufficiency. And thus we ought to learn, better than ever, how our need and His great fulness meet. We are much to blame that we have not done so. And the sin of Marah is the sin of the blind and unseeing eye. For when, in later days, we go back to the fountain of all that is best in our deepest life, we often find that the fountain has been a bitter one, a sorrow, a disillusionment, which God Himself had to explain and sweeten and transfigure. Here was His statute and ordinance for us. Here was the cross He would have us bear, the injunction He would have us obey. In the end we recognize it has brought us a new hold of Him, a new strengthening of character, and a new pulse of vision and power. But we should have been sure of these things from the first.

So Marah is the place of our weakness and sin. But we have to deal with a God who multiplies to forgive. He bears and forbears. He soothes and heals. Not only does He check our impatience by revealing some medicinal tree which transmutes the brackish waters into a clear and cooling draught, but He hastens us on to where the wells are all our thirsty hearts can wish for.

3. The next thing, therefore, to be remarked is that *Elim is near to the king's highway.* Elim may meet us at any moment or in any spot. For example, it is the fellowship of Sabbath worship, the familiar house of God, the Church which brings us week by week its prayers and praises, its light and quickening. If we refuse to let the Church become a mere conventional resort, if we are resolved that our Lord and we shall talk there face to face, we shall go from its gates with our cares banished, with our steps buoyant, with our courage redoubled to fight the enemies of righteousness, with our features radiant and shining. Or Elim is the loyalty of a friend. Or Elim is an opportunity of service. When we are tired ourselves, when it is dark weather with us, it sometimes cheers us mightily, it restores our brightness and our peace, to try and succour another soul in its need. Once Christ was wearied in His journey; but a woman drew near Him with a profounder and more overwhelming weariness than His Own; and He lifted away her load; and then He could tell His disciples, 'I have meat to eat that ye know not of.' Or Elim is a quiet time with God. He calls us away from other engagements and other companions, it may be by a grief that no other can share, it may be by a gladness with which a stranger and even a friend cannot intermeddle, it may be by an intensified conviction that apart from Him we can do nothing; and, as we wait in the solitude with

Him alone, our strength is enhanced as the strength of ten.

4. The last truth is this, that *Elim is not the goal, but it is an aid towards the goal.*

Elim! Elim! though the way be long,
Unmurmuring I shall journey, and lift my heart in song;
And Elim! Elim! all my song shall tell
Of rest beneath the palm tree, and joy beside the well.

Elim has furnished us with supply. The oasis has its twelve springs, one for each of the tribes of Israel, one for each of the months of the year, one for each of the dispositions and temperaments of men. It has furnished us with shadow. The trees rise straight and stately above the wells, threescore and ten of them, as many as the years of our life upon earth. And it has furnished us with rest. We encamped there by the waters. Now we can take the heartening memory of it with us to solace us when we are again in the sand and the sun. In fact, we have what is better than the memory. For, in the life of the Spirit, we surpass the men of Israel in their faring through the great wilderness. They had only one Elim, but we may have a multitude; and God's presence, and Christ's grace, and the Holy Ghost's communion should never fail us until we are safe home at length.[1]

SEXAGESIMA SUNDAY.

The Manliness of Jesus.

'Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.'—Jn 16^{33}.

In every generation our religion has to defend itself against criticism. And we need not wonder. For it claims to be the final expression of the highest life man can find. A fashionable objection is that Christianity is a religion of the weak. What, they say, is the central command of Jesus? It is: Resist not evil, turn the other cheek, love your enemies, pray for those who maltreat you. Well, that is the virtue of the defenceless and the down-trodden, the feeble folk who cannot battle for themselves. Science teaches that the world is a place of struggle where men are driven by the wants and desires within them and where the prizes are for those who can take them. The religion of Jesus is outside this circle of ideas: it is not in tune with Nature, which is a nursing-mother of strong men. Its note is not the resounding note of battle, the clarion call which thrills the hearts of the brave and brings the joy of victory. Rather, it is the consolation of the humble, the joy of the obscure, the comfort and strength of the weak. It is a religion for slaves.

That is a criticism of Christianity that strikes at its very heart. But it is founded on a wrong sense of value: strength and self-reliance are grand qualities; little excellence is to be gathered without them; but they are second to love; and they are much more easily compassed. As the modern poet of doubt has told us:

> But in the world I learnt, what there
> Thou too wilt surely one day prove,
> That will, that energy, though rare,
> Are yet far far less rare than love.

But is this criticism in any way true? Is Christianity an apotheosis of weakness? What is our Christian faith but the adoration and imitation of Jesus? Look at Him and declare if in all the history of the world there is the record of any braver and more courageous soul than He.

1. Take the matter of physical courage. That is the lesser form of manliness, but the world always admires most the virtue nearest its own capacity and therefore most obvious. How stands our Lord when tried by that test? Is He who counselled non-resistance to be ranked among the timid or the brave?

When for the first time He preached at Nazareth He stirred the townsfolk against Him. The Jews were a hot, turbulent people, utterly ungovernable when their religious passions were roused. By His sermon Jesus inflamed them to the murder point. They mobbed Him as He came out of the synagogue: they led Him to the brow of the hill above the town and would have cast Him headlong to death. A brave soldier has said that the most unnerving spectacle is that of an angry mob seeking to lynch a man. It requires greater fortitude to face that than the whistling bullets and shrieking shells of war. Jesus faced it with such self-possession and dignity of bearing that the wild mob were overawed.

Look again at Him in the Garden of Olives and before the Rulers. Napoleon the Great has said that the finest courage is three-o'clock-in-the-morning courage. It was in the grey hours of the morning, after a night of mental agony that made His sweat as it were drops of blood, that the soldiers came. Jesus might well have been worn out, weak as is a breaking wave. Among all the actors in that long-drawn-out drama He is the one

[1] A. Smellie, *Sunset Glory*, 40.

man who kept untroubled the peace and possession of His soul. The soldiers shrank from laying hands on Him, awed like the villagers of Nazareth by His peace and dignity. Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin were the slaves of passion; Pilate was tossed between anger and contempt and pitiful weakness; Jesus alone was master of all His powers. What worshipper of courage could desire a better leader than Jesus of Nazareth?

2. Let us consider now how Jesus stands to moral courage, the far rarer and more splendid virtue.

We have seen that in the great crises, those calls which make a sudden demand upon all a man's courage, our Lord shows Himself like a man inspired. Were these exceptions in His life? Did the Teacher of love and meekness bear Himself in all else, as one of the timid or weak to whom gentleness is the only possible virtue? No, the truth rather is that courage is the foundation quality of His character; courage is the woof on which were interwoven all those strands of pity and gentleness and meekness which make up that lovely and noble soul.

Take up the Gospel of St. Mark, and read the first story of His public activity, and what do you find? You see Him offending the religious world —the party that was most powerful in the land. He healed a man in the synagogue on the Sabbath day. The apostle of the modern worship of strength accuses the Christian religion of timidity. Its chief virtue, he says, is prudence, whereas the true counsel is—throw prudence to the winds and live dangerously. The Prophet of Nazareth, when in the wilderness He planned His way, elected to live dangerously. He set forth deliberately on a road that was bound to give mortal offence to the rulers of the Church. He healed on the Sabbath: He did works of loving-kindness on that day which in their eyes was to be polluted by no manner of work. He neglected also the many fastings and prayers and ceremonial cleansings which they deemed the very mark of a true worshipper of Jehovah. He companied freely with sinners and outcasts: and He even taught that the Kingdom of God would number them as citizens sooner than those who seemed specially holy and religious. The truth demanded that He should speak and act so: sympathy and love for man demanded that He should speak and act so: and though He saw the faces of all the religious leaders set as flint against Him, yet He never looked aside. Prudence was never His loved companion or chosen ally; truth and love for men and the passionate desire to bless them with freedom and joy in serving God were His companions. He knew the danger from the beginning. For in Nazareth those quiet eyes had read the hearts of men: they had seen the pride and worldliness of scribe and rabbi. He did not encounter them for the first time in His public life. Jesus knew well that the blessed message of God which makes all men equal and seeks only to redeem would not fall like music on the ears of proud and vainglorious men. But God the Father had called Him to this task—love for men had called Him: and, having girt up His loins for the bold enterprise and committed His soul to the Father, He went forth to the battle, never fearing, never turning aside, to win at last only by the absolute sacrifice of Himself.

The Carpenter of Nazareth had the courage to oppose the religious world of His day, the men of influence and power. But many a demagogue has done that, upborne by the cheers of the mob. What really tests a man's courage and his insight is his relation to his neighbours. The honour and love of the little world in which we dwell, the look in the faces that are round about us night and day, these are the powers that test a man's sincerity and courage. Jesus was a Man of the people, He was also a layman rather than a churchman, exposed to the public opinion of the people rather than of the religious class. How did He bear Himself in relation to this world, the world of men and women whose thoughts and opinions had been the air His spirit breathed?

We find that He opposed this world as resolutely and completely as He opposed the world of scribe and Pharisee. The people would not be so out of sympathy with His preaching and conduct as the rabbis and ecclesiastics. They lived more simply among the common thoughts and charities: religious pride was not theirs to narrow their sympathies. But they had the limitations of the people, which are the same in all ages and in all lands. They had material conceptions of life: their dreams of a Messiah and of the blessings of His time were of the earth earthy. They hoped for political freedom, and national glory and prosperity; they desired days when their corn and wine would abound and all manner of material good be spread over the land. Jesus belonged to their class, but He knew that not in better wages and dwellings was to be found the secret of happiness. He dared to cherish another dream, the dream of a new society wherein men should become sons of God whose joy is to help and bless. It showed rare courage to send His hopes along this

lonely road where neither the thought of His neighbours nor the thought of the rabbis had gone. Only let Him bend to their earthly dreams, and they will set Him on high. But not for one moment did the Carpenter of Nazareth bend. He made it clear to them as the day that His mission was not political: that He was bringing them no social or economic panacea for the world's ills, but the preaching of love as the creative spirit in our life, the delight in goodness and the joy in brotherhood as the hope for men. And then they fell away from Him with the anger of disappointed hope in their hearts.

Jesus went His own way. Deep in His heart He heard a voice which He knew to be the voice of God the Father in His heart. And with unfaltering steps He followed whithersoever it led: down into the dark shadow of the world's opposition, on amid the wrath and curses of men, till at last on the Cross, Rome's gibbet of shame for slaves, it crowned Him with thorns.

In the long roll of human heroism, is there courage to be set beside His ?[1]

QUINQUAGESIMA SUNDAY.

The Supremacy of Love.

'But now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is love.'—1 Co 13[13].

With this simple but almost fathomless sentence the Apostle brings this exquisite hymn to a finish. He ends it on the top note. In the verses immediately preceding he has been asserting the superiority of love over the gifts of tongues and prophecy and knowledge—the gifts on which the Corinthians plumed and prided themselves—on the ground that, while these gifts were transient and temporary, love was permanent. But in this verse Paul says something about love more wonderful still. Not only is love better than such transient things as prophecy and tongues and knowledge, but of the permanent and abiding things love is the greatest and the best. For love is not the only thing that abides. Faith abides, and hope abides as well.

A whole school of commentators, beginning with Chrysostom, put a rather different construction upon the verse from that which is commonly received. They treat that word 'Now' with which the verse opens as being not the 'now' of logic, but the 'now' of time. '*Now*,' i.e. in this present time, in this temporal sphere, there are three abiding things—faith, hope, and love. But in the eternal world faith and hope will disappear; there will be no further occasion for their exercise. But love will live on through all eternity.

But though a great many scholars favour that interpretation, we are quite persuaded that the ordinary interpretation is the right one. It is impossible to think that the word 'abideth' when applied to 'faith and hope' means 'abideth for a time'; but that when applied to love it means 'abideth for ever.' This is what Paul says: 'Now abideth faith, hope, love.' So far as the 'abiding' is concerned these three graces stand on the same plane. They are permanent graces of the soul. 'Now abideth faith, hope, love—these three.' Can we understand how this should be ?

Let us begin with *faith*. Does not faith in its essence mean this—trust in God, the confidence of the soul in God, the clinging of the soul to God ? When we say that we walk by faith, not by sight, is not that what we mean, that we trust God though we cannot see Him ? We believe that in the deepest darkness He is at work, though we cannot behold Him. We stake everything on the belief that He is love, even though events challenge and seem to deny our faith. 'Even though he slay me yet will I trust him.' Well, won't there be room for faith in that sense of trust, 'the clinging of the heart to God and to a living, personal Christ,' as Dr. Edwards puts it, in the life of heaven ? Will faith as a matter of fact not flourish more vigorously than ever ? What our clear vision of God, our sight of Him face to face will do, is not to do away with faith but to intensify it.

And what about *hope* ? We have found reason for the permanence of faith in the fact that the relation between man and God will always be that of joyful and adoring trust. We find the reason for the permanence of hope in the nature of that heaven-life itself. We make a mistake if we think of all the denizens of heaven as being on the same level. 'One star differeth from another star in glory,' says St. Paul. 'So also,' he adds, 'is the resurrection of the dead.' There are differences in heaven, differences of attainment and glory. There are some who are scarcely saved, and there are some who have an abundant entrance into the heavenly habitations. And this fact of difference in attainment is quite compatible with the perfect blessedness of all. Each has all the blessedness he can contain. There is fulness of joy for all, though the capacity for joy may vary in each case. And just as there are differences between the inhabitants of heaven, so there are differences in the same person at different stages. There is progress even in heaven. Our condition is not fixed for ever

[1] R. Glaister, *The Beauty of the Lord*, 154.

once we reach there. 'In my Father's house,' said Jesus, 'there are many mansions.' 'Resting-places,' the word really means, and it refers to those 'stations' on the great roads where travellers could get rest and refreshment before proceeding on their journey. The notions both of repose and progress, says Bishop Westcott, are in the word. We shall be moving on, so to speak, from one resting-place to another. And, as Dr. Edwards says, so long as progress is possible, hope has not ceased.

The progress of heaven is not that we are gradually emancipated from sin and gradually gain the vision of God's face, but that as we contemplate God's love we grow in our knowledge of God and enter upon an ever-enlarging life in Him. But the progress is sure. The perfection of to-day will merge into the larger perfection of to-morrow. There is always something richer and better to look for. There is room for hope in the life of heaven. As Mr. Percy Ainsworth puts it: 'Faith and hope will not cease to live when they no longer have to fight for their lives. They are not mere adjuncts of human life. They are the fundamental terms of our personal existence and the eternal conditions of our relationship with God, and they must abide so long as God and the soul abide.'

So faith and hope, as well as love, are permanent and abiding things. They have their place in the life of heaven. 'Now abideth faith, hope, love, these three,' and only these three. And then the Apostle adds these words: 'and the greatest of these is love.'

Now can we see why love is greater than either faith or hope?

1. *Without love, faith and hope are themselves imperfect.* St. Paul has said as much as that in plain language about faith. 'If I have all faith so as to remove mountains and have not love . . . I am nothing.' There is a kind of faith which hasn't very much love in it. It is the kind of faith which lays hold of the merits of Christ, but has nothing in it of a spontaneous and eager delight in God. And there is a kind of hope which hasn't very much love in it. The hope which animates some Christian people is like that very materialistic hope that possessed the hearts of the first disciples and which prompted Peter one day to say, 'Lo, we have left all, and followed thee, what then shall we get?' What they hope for is reward—or, at any rate, escape from punishment. But such faith and such hope are poor and imperfect things. Both need love for their perfection. Love changes faith from trust in Christ's merits into an enthusiastic devotion to Christ Himself. Love transforms hope from hope of reward into hope of likeness to Christ, and blessed union with Him.

So far St. Paul takes us in this chapter. But it is St. John who supplies us with the final reason why love is greater than either faith or hope.

2. *Love is the Divine grace.* You cannot describe God in terms of faith or hope. 'God, the all-knowing, does not believe. God, the all-possessing, does not hope.' But you can describe God in terms of love. Indeed, those are the only terms in which you can describe Him—God is love. Power, wisdom, omnipresence—those are attributes of God. But love is His very nature. That is the truth blazoned for us in the Cross of Jesus. We might have been doubtful of it but for that final and subduing revelation. God gave His Son to death and shame for love. Faith and hope are eternal things, inasmuch as they are the abiding conditions of our relationship with God, but when we love we share God's very life.

'The greatest thing in the world,' says Henry Drummond. Of course it is that. It is the chief spring of such happiness as we enjoy down here. 'Why,' asks Drummond, 'do you want to live to-morrow? It is because there is some one who loves you and whom you want to see to-morrow and be with and love back.'

And if we only knew it, love is the healing of our world's hurt. It is not only the fountain of happiness for the individual life; it is the only possible means of quietness and peace for our world. It is not by new arrangements and changes of method we are going to bring peace and goodwill back to our disordered world, but by a change of spirit. We may make what changes of method and of organization we please, but so long as we have the same selfish spirit, strife and division, unrest and discontent will be with us still. But though our methods and our organization remained as they are—confessedly imperfect, to say the least—if only we had, filling the hearts of men, this love which envieth not, which beareth, hopeth, and believeth all things, and which never fails, love by itself as by a stroke of a magician's wand would present us with the new world.

Love is not only the best thing in life, and the healing of the world's hurt, it is the Alpha and Omega of religion. You can sum up religion in terms of love. For what is the final and ultimate source of this Christian faith of ours? What is its primal and original fount? Why, the infinite love of God. 'God so loved the world.'

When does religion begin in us? When love

for God wakens in these hearts of ours. When looking into the face of Jesus—that torn and scarred visage—we say with Peter, 'Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee.' And how does religion show itself? What is its practical effect in life? And again we say, 'Love.' By this know we that we have passed out of death into life—because we love the brethren. And if we have not love; if we have not the spirit of Christ we are none of His. If we have not got it—do we desire it? How can love be got? Where can love be kindled? At the Cross of Jesus. Gaze at that Cross long enough and realize that it was for us He hung and suffered there—and love will be born.[1]

FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT.

Mary's Tribute of Devotion.

'That which this woman hath done.'—Mk 14[9] (R.V.).

We need not stay to apologize for an action which received our Lord's commendation. It is to be feared that there are still people afflicted with that meanness of disposition which measures all things by a utilitarian standard. Generous hearts must lay their account with the churlishness which will never learn to estimate the significance of their services except in terms of pounds, shillings, and pence. Yet there are more things, and these things the greatest in life, than are dreamt of in the philosophy of those who regard arithmetic as the queen of sciences, in whose imaginations the only thing that glitters is gold, and who look upon the conventional standards of society as the final oracles of moral obligation. The spirit of Mary, begotten and evoked by the Spirit of Jesus Christ Himself, reproduced in the lives of martyrs and confessors, saints and benefactors, reformers and evangelists, has kept the Church alive, and caused it to be owned down the centuries by God as an instrument for the fulfilment of His purposes.

With regard to the plea on behalf of the poor, what our Lord said was, 'Ye have the poor always with you.' Their claims exist, and have to be met, of course. Deeds that are directly charitable we are all bound to perform. 'But what are the poor?' as Dr. Parker said. 'Mere eaters and drinkers, gormandizers, people gathered around a trough to eat and drink? Have they not eyes, imaginations, sensibilities, divinity of nature, that can be touched by the appeals of beauty and music and heroism and nobleness? We misunderstand the poor when we suppose that they can only eat and drink, and that to give to them means to give something into their hands, or something they can gnaw with their teeth. It is a base idea.' Had Mary been dissuaded from performing her beautiful deed, and the three hundred pence been devoted to the charities of Bethany and Jerusalem, the poor as well as the rich in every age would have been grievously impoverished. Judas's censure is a slander on the poor, implying as it does that they would accept his preferring of their claims in such a case. Is it not amongst the poor that you meet with some of the most thrilling instances of lavish generosity and devotion?

Let us indicate one or two features of that action of Mary's, which will ever be spoken of 'for a memorial of her.'

1. *She did what she could.* The Master Himself said, 'She hath done what she could.'

It was not a deed performed on the impulse of the moment. The alabaster cruse of spikenard was not in Mary's possession by a happy chance. She had given much thought to the question of how she could best show her reverence and love for her Lord. Some declaration of her devotion she felt she must make. Speech did not come readily to her. Mary's was a deep and silent nature. She was certain she could never tell Jesus to His face all that was in her heart. But might she not try to do what that other woman had done to Him in Galilee, when He was seated in the house of Simon the Pharisee? If she, with all the shame and sorrow that clung about her heart, could bring herself to perform such a courageous and lovely action, why not Mary also? It would mean exposing herself to public gaze, she that was so timid and diffident by nature. It would mean subjecting herself to misunderstanding and cruel criticism, she that was so gentle and sensitive in disposition. Every man and woman with any sensibility will recognize that the costly part of Mary's action was the action itself, and not the fragrant spikenard which her trembling hands poured forth.

Does not her example waken new desires and purposes in our heart? Our Lord only asks us to do what we can. But what we can do is not the thing we feel able to do without any difficulty.

2. *She did more than she knew.* It was not given to Mary to anticipate the significance which her gracious action would have for the Saviour. How it gladdened and inspired Him in view of the awful ordeal that lay before Him! 'She hath anointed my body,' He declared, 'aforehand for the burying.' What a service she was privileged

[1] J. D. Jones, *The Greatest of These*, 231.

to render to her Lord! Our actions always perform a ministry beyond our immediate intentions. 'It is impossible,' says Mark Rutherford, 'to limit the effect which even an insignificant life may have.' You speak a kindly word, for example, to some one, and if you think at all about what you have done, you attach little importance to the episode. But the person, whom you have treated in that manner, has an inner history of his own, and you have affected him in relation to experiences that you know nothing about. The things that wear a different appearance for him in consequence, the temptations you have helped him to overcome, the difficulties you have encouraged him to face, are recorded in a book which is sealed to your eyes. And not only is such a person's own life influenced to a degree and in a variety of ways that you never anticipated, but the lives also of others, with whom he comes in contact, participate indirectly in the beneficent effects of what was to you a simple, and soon became a forgotten, incident.

3. *She let her heart have its way.* Once Mary had thought over what she might do, and felt the prompting to do this thing, and realized that she could do it, even though it would cost her many an inward tremor, she resolved to do it, and did it. And so her deed is spoken of to-day 'for a memorial of her.'

It is not that we do not devise generous things in our hearts. Most of us, all of us surely, do that. But the passage between the heart and the lips, between the heart and the hands, is too often blocked. Strive to keep these lines of communication open and in good repair, that ideal impulses may come to their fulfilment in the actualities of life. Undertake the irksome task, say the kindly and forgiving word, write the magnanimous letter, give the generous gift. We cannot summon up the passionate feelings of devotion for Christ that inspired Mary of Bethany. But let us be true to those noble emotions that urge us from time to time, and our natures will be deepened and enriched with larger and rarer capacities. It can never be our privilege to render such a personal service to our Lord as Mary rendered. But, inasmuch as we do it unto one of the least of His brethren, our action is interpreted and accepted as done unto Him.[1]

[1] A. B. Macaulay, *The Word of the Cross*, 177.

Paul's Prayer for the Ephesians.

A STUDY OF EPHESIANS i. 15–23.

By the Reverend H. J. Flowers, B.D., Chorley Wood, Herts.

I.

The prayer of Paul is that God will give to his readers *the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him; so that, the eyes of their heart being enlightened, they may know what is the hope of His calling, what the riches of the glory of His grace, and what the exceeding greatness of His power to those that believe.* That is, the prayer is for real spiritual enlightenment, so that the people may get beneath the surface and see the great abiding truths of the Christian faith and of the nature of God. The readers have already received the Spirit. That is the permanent possession of the Christian community, and is imparted to all those joining the community in sincerity in baptism. But what is now asked for is a continual supply of spiritual grace, mainly for the purpose of enlightenment. Men and women could possess the Spirit and yet have no real understanding of the intellectual and spiritual content of the faith. Their energy might go off into other directions, as, for example, into the direction of the Glossolalia.

One or two points must be made clear first.

(1) Paul is speaking of the Spirit as the bestower of wisdom and revelation. This has been disputed by some scholars, who have said that what is asked for is that temper in the Christians and that attitude of mind by means of which revelation and wisdom come into the human heart. But this is quite unnatural, and also tautologous. It is also dead against the general teaching of the New Testament, which regards wisdom and revelation and insight into the bigness and truth of the Christian message as granted to us, on certain conditions, of course, from the outside, through the agency of the Spirit. There are cases in which it is hard to decide whether πνεῦμα shall be interpreted as the Spirit of God or the spirit of man, but that does not seem to be the case here.

(2) The spirit of wisdom and revelation was granted to the Christian community. The great secrets of the faith, the Christian hope, the nature of the Kingdom of God, and so on, were open secrets. They could be shared in by all who were willing to submit themselves to the leading of the Spirit. Naturally, they could not be revealed to the outside world, because those outside the Church had nothing to which these things could appeal. But Christianity was not esoteric in the sense of the Mysteries. Baptized Christians did not have to make vows of secrecy. The gospel was for all, and the full content of the gospel would be revealed to all who could appreciate it.

(3) φωτισμένους points back to the initial enlightenment of the Christian at baptism by the bestowal of the Spirit. By the time of Justin Martyr, φωτισμός as applied to baptism had become a technical term. κλῆσις looks back to the fact that God is the moving factor at the back of the conversion of the Christian. κληρονομία interprets Christianity eschatologically. It is a term taken over by Paul from the Old Testament to define the reward of those who believe in Christ. What Paul is speaking of here is the Kingdom that will be set up at the Parousia. But a foretaste of that Kingdom is already vouchsafed to the saints. The repetition of αὐτοῦ shows how all through Paul is dominated by the idea of the Divine origin of everything belonging to the Christian.

One of the motives for the writing of the sister Epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians was to oppose the Gnosticism which was beginning to affect the purity of the Christian message. This comes to more definite expression in the Colossian Epistle, where the Gnosticism attacked seems to be of a Jewish character, but the apologetic is also fairly plain in the Letter to the Ephesians.

Gnosticism is the name applied to the movement pretty widely prevalent in the first two centuries of the Christian era to interpret Christianity as Gnosis or Knowledge. Its origins have been sought for in several different directions, in Egypt, Persia, Babylonia, Phrygia, and so on, but it is impossible to tie down one particular area or one particular school of thinkers as the source of it. It was part of the syncretistic movement at the time. The astral beliefs and myths of various primitive religions were given some sort of a synthesis by the aid of Greek philosophy, to offer salvation to the soul and to impart that supernatural knowledge which was thought to be the secret of real religion. It proved to be a barren movement, completely without a message for later ages, totally incapable of controlling with its abstract philosophical speculation the crude mythology from which it sprang.

In so far as Gnosticism affected Christianity in the New Testament period, it exhibited the following features :—

(1) It pretended to be a Divine philosophy, to impart a higher supernatural knowledge than could be brought to the commonalty of men by the preaching of the simple gospel of Jesus Christ. The various Gnostic sects professed to be the repositories of systems of sacred learning, which they could impart by means of sacred rites and magical formulæ. The knowledge that matters and leads to salvation is not scientific or discovered by research ; it is intuitive and immediate, supernatural in origin, and is obtained by mystical enlightenment. By participating in certain rites, the Gnostic obtains the vision of the real nature of God, and has immediacy of fellowship with Him.

(2) There was a tendency to posit media between God and men. There were various orders of angels who were to be honoured and worshipped. God is unknowable and ineffable. In fact, He is not so much a personal God as the abstract ground of all existence. His method of approach to the material world is through these beings, the totality of whom form the Pleroma. They are the manifestations of God in descending order of greatness. This is obviously but the speculative treatment of myth and polytheism.

(3) Together with Christianity and indeed nearly all religion of that time, Gnosticism professed to be a means of redemption. But there the likeness ends. The soul of the Christian doctrine of salvation is that it is ethical and eschatological. Salvation is from sin, and the saved person becomes a member of the Kingdom of God. In Gnosticism, salvation is not from sin, but rather from materiality. The material world is itself evil. That explains the alienation of the unknown God from it. Gnosticism is frankly dualistic through and through. And salvation or spiritual enlightenment is not imparted by a profound and thorough change of ethical front, but rather by rites and ceremonies which have a magical effect.

(4) Gnosticism teaches a sheer cleavage between the 'spiritual' man and the man of a lower order. Gnosis is only for the few who owe their origin to the unknowable God. Those of a lower order cannot have Gnosis : they have to depend upon the lower quality of faith.

(5) Gnosticism was bound up with myth and

had little use for history. No matter how much later Gnostics tried to explain and allegorize the myths, their crudities could never be covered up by their speculative scheme. When Christ was taken up into the scheme, His historical reality was practically denied. Facts were merely allegorical of profound spiritual truths. *Alles Vergängliche ist nur ein Gleichnis.* The dualism of the Gnostics led them to deny the reality of the Incarnation, and to regard the body of Jesus as illusory.

In answer to this sort of thinking, the apologetic of the Christian Church, particularly as it is represented in this Epistle, took up and emphasized the following points:

(1) The Christian gospel was universal. Gnosticism in all its forms suffered from the fatal tendency of regarding saving knowledge as being confined to a few chosen people. This was a tendency to which nearly all ancient thought of a Greek and Eastern nature fell a prey. Early Christianity preached the doctrine of election, but the springs of this doctrine in Christianity are vastly different from the springs of it in Gnosticism. It arose out of the Jewish conception of Israel as the chosen race, elected out of the nations because of God's love for her. But the Gnostic doctrine had its origin in no such historic fact as that, but was part and parcel of a dualistic system of philosophy which was imported from the outside and with which history, if it was regarded at all, had to be made to square. Then also, the early Christian doctrine of election was interpreted ethically. Men were chosen by God in order to be Godlike, and in order to spread the truth of Christ. Election and Godliness were bound up together. But so far as we can judge, the Gnostic doctrine of election had no ethical end or basis. Logically, it did not lead to sane ethical life, but either to asceticism or to libertinism. And further still, in spite of the predestinarianism which Paul and other Christians certainly held, it was made perfectly clear that the gospel was for the whole world. The Christian gospel was nothing if it was not catholic.

(2) Christianity kept close to historic fact. The life and death of Jesus were both alike real. His body and bodily passions were not illusory. Moreover, in the historic fact of Christ was centred the Christian gospel. Jesus was the revelation of the Person of God in real human life. His Cross was God's chosen way for redeeming sinners. Those historic facts formed the very soul of early Christian teaching and thinking. They were not explained away or interpreted as only allegorical.

(3) The Church disputed the validity of the Gnostic system of knowledge. The mystery of God had been revealed by Christ to the Church, and it was only those who shared in that mystery who really possessed saving knowledge. The Church was dealing with realities, a real personal, self-revealing God, and not a mere abstract unknown; a real, personal, historic Christ, and not the sham life of a phantom; real spiritual and ethical facts, and not shallow and empty phrases. The Church began definitely to set itself against the Gnostic sects as being the repository of truth. Later on, this led to the canonization of the New Testament, and the drawing up of a *regula fidei*. The days of dogma had not yet come when Paul was alive. But already the limits of allowable speculation were beginning to be laid down. The Christian must confess that Jesus is the Lord, and by Jesus was meant Jesus and not an abstraction. The Church possessed real knowledge, because, being the body of Christ, it had had revealed to it the mystery of God.

(4) The Church stressed the fact that knowledge was bound up with character. It had its source in faith, love, and godliness. Love leads to knowledge, and it is the power to love which shows that we possess saving knowledge.

(5) The Church emphasized in season and out of season the fact of the supremacy of Jesus Christ. He was the centre of God's redemptive purpose. To preach Christ, His life and death and the power of His resurrection, was the Christian's duty. To preach any other name or to build upon any other foundation than had already been laid was to fall away into sin.

And so, led by Paul and the authors of the Fourth Gospel and the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Christian Church, in its fight against Gnosticism, began to see the folly of idle speculation and to come back to the reality of Christ and the supremacy of the truths that had been revealed in Him. In fighting the foe, however, the Church went a long way along with it. The Gnostic doctrine of the chosen spirits was embodied, to some extent, in the distinction that Paul drew between 'the men' and 'the babes.' Naturally, Paul would have said that it was open to every babe to grow into a man. But one feels, at times, that the distinction is absolute and fundamental. The way was being prepared for the time when Origen would teach that there were two kinds of Christians—the humbler sort who lived by faith, and the supreme kind who lived by Gnosis. The democratic Church was being tarred with the brush of intellectual snobbery. Further, it seems as if the difference between men

and babes lay in the ability of the former to understand a speculative Christology. The emphasis was beginning to be laid, not on the simple message of the Cross, but on the understanding of the deep things of Christ, in whom the fullness of God dwelt. In spite of the battle against heresy, Paul was something of a Gnostic, and was beginning to define in his own mind what he thought real Gnosis to be. But he kept near to the soul of things. He believed in the folly of preaching, which was the wisdom of God, and he opposed the speculation about Greek mythology which was folly and did not lead to God. At the centre of his preaching, there was the Cross. Gnosis meant moral insight. Above all, revelation came from God through the medium of the Spirit rather than through magical formulæ.

He asks for the Ephesian Christians the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of God in order that they may know the deep things of the faith. What does he mean, and what is the source of his conception?

He looks upon the Christian life as being, in all its aspects, under the guidance of the Spirit of God. The Spirit is the principle of the Christian life. The Spirit comes into a man and delivers him from everything that weakens and confines him, and leads him into freedom and life. There are various gifts of the Spirit. These range from the gift of tongues, through the power of interpretation, prophecy, and the power to work miracles up to wisdom and revelation, which are of all the charismata the most enduring, the most useful for the Church, and the most effective in building up the character of the community. But high above all the gifts there are faith, hope, and love, which are undying. Here, again, Paul shows us the sane way in which he looks upon the power of the Spirit. It is not ecstasy that matters, nor the power of working miracles, but the possession of a healthy ethical life. *Omnia abeunt ad mores.*

In the ancient world, there were, in the main, three methods of seeking the knowledge of God. The Greeks sought it by speculation. Their apprehension of things was always intellectual. They gathered together all the facts that the world presented to them, and by the use of their own faculties they tried to get at the principles behind them. What they give to us is the conception of God as the principle behind phenomena. The Oriental, whether the Indian or the devotee of the cults, was a mystic. History meant little to him. He found God in his own heart. He shut the door of his soul to all distracting influences, and he found that in the silence he was brought face to face with God. In fact, he found himself being absorbed by God. The Hebrew was neither a mystic nor a philosopher. He was a religious man and a moralist. In history and in the world of Nature, God had defined His character and written His law. The way to the knowledge of God was to listen to His voice and to obey His will. These are the three ways to the knowledge of God in the ancient world: the speculative, the mystical, and the ethical.

Paul certainly accepts the third. He keeps close to history. Along with genuine Hebrew tradition, he believes that by the knowledge of and by obedience to the will of God, as declared in the prophets, recorded in the Scriptures, and particularly as evidenced by Jesus Christ, would come knowledge. The prophets delivered messages from God because they were under the direct guidance of the Spirit of God. That was also the feeling in the early Church. Whether the Christian prophets merely gave predictions regarding the future, or gave expression to their visions, or unfolded the deep mysteries of the Person of Christ, it was felt that they were under the influences of the Spirit who was the medium of Divine revelation to those who obeyed the commands of the Spirit as declared to the prophet. In the Church also, the feeling was that Jesus, because He was from first to last under the control of the Spirit, was a revelation of the character and will of God. And this in spite of the fact that, for whatever reason, the Spirit, in the thought of our Lord, as shown to us in the Synoptics, holds little or no place. Paul embodies genuine Hebrew feeling when he regards the acceptance of God's revelation and of His will, whether in the facts of life and history, or in the messages of the prophets, or supremely in the Person of Christ, as the way to the knowledge of God. He looks upon the knowledge of God as being the knowledge of His character, His will, and His purpose for men.

But it cannot be said that that is all that he means. Already there had come about a sort of *rapprochement* between Greek speculation and Eastern mysticism, and also in the person of Philo, between that union and the Hebrew tradition. The speculative thinking of the Greeks was fading away, and it was beginning to be felt that unaided and through the exercise merely of their own faculties, men could not obtain knowledge of the ultimate nature of things. The way to knowledge must be the way of revelation. Faith and supernatural enlightenment must take the place of reasoned

argument and scientific knowledge. The human will must be surrendered to the influences of the Divine, and the pride of human endeavour and research must be given up. The man of knowledge really gets his knowledge from above, by the grace of God, and by emptying his mind of all speculative and scientific interests. And also the man of real knowledge does not trouble about phenomena: he is after the mysteries, the unseen things, the nature of God.

There is no doubt that Paul was under the influence of this kind of thinking. He felt himself to be under the influence of the Spirit and so looked upon his message as that of God. The Spirit was given by God to unfold the mysteries of the Christian gospel. His follower, the author of the Fourth Gospel, agreed with him. The Spirit was sent to lead us into all truth. The gospel of the Cross meant more than appeared on the surface. In its plain simple meaning, it was sufficient for salvation. But the secret truths, the nature of the Person of Christ, the relation between Christ and God, the future of the world, and so on, were beyond the reach of ordinary thought, and could be revealed only by the Spirit. It was the revelation of these secret things that Paul asks for the Church.

The source of his thought is not Jewish alone. Obviously, there is a Greek element there. This is only to be expected. He is thinking of the knowledge of those things belonging to God which are beyond the reach of ordinary reason and have nothing to do with the world of sense; of truths, moreover, which do not come merely as a reward of obedience and faithful discipleship. He is thinking of ultimate mysteries, which can be known by men only if they are revealed by God, and which are shown only in ecstasy and mystic communion with the Divine Spirit. But the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ. The knowledge of the Christian is Christian knowledge. Nothing revealed in an ecstasy is true which denies or undermines the influence of Christ. His Gnosis is sane and ethical. It is bound up with the knowledge of God's will, and with the ethical fruits of the Spirit. The Gnosis of the Christian must serve a genuine Christian purpose. He must not hug it to himself: it must be used for the edification of the Church, and the extending of the Kingdom of God. It has not been given as a reward of desert: it is the expression of the grace of God. And above all, at the back of the whole thing, there is a genuine Christian experience. Only those can be Christian Gnostics who have been redeemed by the grace of God in the Cross of Christ.

II.

Paul speaks of the power of God, *which He wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead, and made Him to sit at His right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and He put all things in subjection under His feet, and gave Him to be head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.*

As in the previous section, it will be well to touch lightly upon one or two smaller points before turning to the main thought of the passage.

(1) The power of God in the resurrection of Christ must be noticed. It is not a metamorphosis such as is found in much ancient myth. It is not the allegorizing of some natural process, as in some of the Mysteries. It is not on the same lines as the story of Ishtar's violent descent to the underworld and return from it. There is no real parallel to it. The resurrection of Jesus is accepted by all the New Testament Christians as a fact, whatever be the precise nature of the fact, and it is because of their belief in the historic fact that they are Christians. Behind it is the power of God. It was by the sheer putting forth of His grace and strength that He made Christ to rise from the dead. Needless to say, that does not mean the re-vivification of the old body. Further, the Resurrection and the Ascension are bound up together. After the Resurrection, Jesus took His place by the right hand of God. He was exalted to the heavenlies. This kind of thought originated in an Adoptionist theology, but by the time that this letter was written, Adoptionism had been left far behind. The central element in Paul's thought is that Jesus Christ who died is now alive for evermore on God's throne.

(2) In the phrase 'in this world and the next,' Paul is adopting the Jewish language concerning the two ages. The Jews drew a distinction between the age before the Messiah came and the age after He had come. The Christians adopted the language, modifying it, as was necessary, seeing that they looked upon the Messiah as already come. 'This age' was the present order, in being until the Parousia, prone to err, material and under the power of the evil one. But the Spirit of Christ was alive in the present order. 'The world to come' would come after the Parousia, would be inaugurated by the Resurrection, and would embody all the blessings of the perfected Kingdom of Christ.

Paul here is using a more or less common phrase to show how completely the authority of Christ will be established.

There are several factors to be taken into account to explain the emphatic way in which Paul speaks of the authority of Christ.

(1) There was the tendency in Gnosticism to bring in media between God and men, and to make Jesus one among many, or else to regard Him as more or less of an abstraction. Gnosticism was part of the great syncretistic movement of the time, which was obscuring the distinctiveness of the various religions by subordinating them to a few broad, general conceptions. This became more influential in the second century, but even in the New Testament period the danger was setting in. Professing Christians were emasculating the gospel of everything that was distinctive. A docetic view of the life of Christ was taken. The Resurrection was denied. The intense ethical reality of our Lord's teaching was obscured. Magic began to creep into the Church. Paul set his face like a flint against all this sort of thing. He emphasized the supremacy of Christ over all angels, systems, and abstractions. Christ is the very centre of the redemptive purpose of God, and the ruling factor at the back of the universe. The dualism inherent in Gnosticism was also implicitly denied by Paul. There was no difference between God the Creator and God the Saviour.

(2) Paul was having to preach to people who were devotees of Attis, Osiris, and the rest of them. Moreover, emperor worship was strengthening, and the wise were beginning to see that the battle of the future was to be the battle between Christ and Cæsar. Paul stands firm. High above all gods, kings, emperors, and empires stands Christ, who is the fullness of God.

(3) Whether he would or not, Paul had to speak in the language of the day. Jesus looked upon Himself as Messiah, but He did not interpret that term in the narrow nationalistic way that had been customary with the Jews. Moreover, He subordinated the conception to His wider thought of the Fatherhood of God. The term was not fundamental to Him, because it was not wide enough. In Christian preaching, it had to be superseded, because it meant as little to the Greek world as it means to us. Wider and wider terms had to be sought for as a means of interpreting the Jewish gospel to the non-Jewish world, and to satisfy the Church's sense of the Divinity of its Lord. At the back of it all there was a genuine experience.

The word *Pleroma* is almost a technical term in later Gnosticism, to express the totality of the Divine manifestations. Some scholars think that Gnosticism adopted the word from Paul rather than Paul from the Gnostics. But this cannot be substantiated. Paul is obviously attacking some false conceptions.

Pleroma is used, of course, in the New Testament, in its ordinary meaning of 'fullness.' But there are many cases in which it is used in a theological sense, almost as a technical expression. There are two points that Paul tries to make. One is that the Pleroma of God, all the fullness of the Divine manifestation, all the powers and energies of God, are to be found in Christ. That being so, there is no need to put any trust in angels. And even if any of these beings are real, Christ is supreme over all, supreme over angels and companies of angels, all powers and forces, in earth and heaven, in this age and the next. Everything is subjected by God to Christ's control.

The second fact that he emphasizes is that, just as Christ is the fullness of God, so the Church, as the body of Christ, is the fullness of Christ. Through union with Christ, the Church shares in and fills up the Divine life.

In this conception, exceedingly difficult to grasp, a conception indeed which Paul, in all probability, did not fully grasp himself, there are a few points that call for study.

(1) Paul is here giving the full fruit of his thinking upon the Person of Christ. There had been little speculation over the precise nature of the relationship between Christ and God. The Church had been satisfied with safeguarding the Divine origin and supreme excellence of the work of Christ. But a man of Paul's intellectual and spiritual calibre would not be able to prevent his mind moving round the subject. He had taken it up time after time and found it too big for him. In the earlier Epistles, he gives us hints as to the way his mind is working, but they are only hints. But now, when the authority of Christ is being undermined, he is forced to think through his position. Christ is the full manifestation of God's glory, the complete revelation of the heart of the Eternal God in the life of man. All the fullness of life which the Gnostics declared served as a medium between God and man was filled up by Christ. Paul could go no further than that in the language of the first century. Christ was the supreme factor in God's work for men. His character was an index to the character of God.

(2) Christ as the Pleroma has a work other than redemptive and revealing: it is creative as well.

The powers which go to the making and preserving of the physical universe are summed up in Him. He is the principle and goal of the cosmic process. There is no dualism between the world and God. Paul attacks Gnosticism at one of its most vital points.

(3) Paul's mysticism must be taken into account. Christ is mystically present in the Church which is His body, and so it is, in a subsidiary way, the Pleroma of God. Paul is a High Churchman. But it is obvious that whether by addition or only by interpretation, he is speaking language other than that of the Jesus of the Gospels. He is defining his own intense faith in Christ and giving expression to his own living experience in the language of Hellenistic Mysticism.

Contributions and Comments.

A Mediaeval Interpretation of John xiii. 1.

At the close of his striking article on the 'Early Christian Interpretation of the Passover,'[1] Dr. Rendel Harris includes the passage with which the fourth Evangelist opens his account of the Last Supper and the Passion: Jn 13^1, 'Now before the feast of the Passover, Jesus knew that his hour was come to migrate from this world to the Father' (ἵνα μεταβῇ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα), and observes how the 'Evangelist himself invites us to see that it is Passover language that he is using.' That this became the recognized and familiar interpretation of the passage is evident from the commentary of Zachary of Besançon on the Harmony of the Gospels (Migne, vol. clxxxvi. col. 493). In this Harmony, as in Codex Fuldensis, Jn 13^{1-18} comes between Mt 26^{16} and Mt 26^{17}, and so stands at the beginning of the story of the last evening. The comment on this first verse is quite brief, and is selected in a somewhat abbreviated form from one of Bede's Homilies,[2] *De Cœna Domini*: the bracketed words are the fuller text of the Homily in the Cologne edition:

> 'Pascha quippe transitus interpretatur (nomen ex eo vetus habens) quod transiit in eo Dominus per Ægyptum, percutiens primogenita eius, et filios Israel liberans, et quod ipsi filii Israel transierunt illa nocte de Ægyptia servitute (ut venirent ad terram promissæ olim hereditatis et pacis). Mystice autem significans quod in eo Dominus transiturus erat de hoc mundo ad Patrem, et fideles eius de temporalibus ad cœlestia.'

[1] The Expository Times, November 1926, p. 88.

[2] The Winchester Codex of Zachary adds a reference in the margin.

The Homily here still more explicitly 'leads on to the City of God':

> 'et quod eius exemplo fideles abjectis temporalibus desideriis transire debeant ad promissionem patriæ cœlestis.'

And we may note how Bede stresses this whole interpretation of Pascha in the opening words of the Homily:

> 'Scripturus Evangelista Joannes memorabile illud Domini mysterium quo discipulis in Pascha, priusquam passionem iret, pedes lavare dignatus est, *primo ipsum nomen quid mystice significaret aperire curavit*, ita incipiens: Ante diem festum Paschæ . . . dilexit eos':

and then follows:

> 'Pascha quippe transitus interpretatur. . . .'

C. A. Phillips.

Bournemouth.

P.S.—A similar explanation was current in Nestorian circles, for, in a MS. of the Book of Centuries of Elias of Anbar in the Woodbrooke collection (Cod. Mingana 31), we read:

> 'Pascha. The migration of the people from Egypt to the desert in their torments, and our migration through Christ the Son from the grave of this world to the world that is to come.'

J. Rendel Harris.

Birmingham.

Luke xxii. 32.

While thinking out a sermon on the subject of Conversion I turned to Moffatt's translation to see how he rendered Lk 22^{32}, the Authorized Version of which, 'When thou art converted, strengthen thy

brethren,' is so firmly fixed in our minds, and, one might almost say, in our Christianity. I find Moffatt translates, 'And you in turn must be a strength to your brothers.' I must say I like that better, but can the Greek stand it? I am not a good enough Greek scholar to judge. The Greek is (in the T.R.) *καὶ σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας, στήριξον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου.* Does not *ἐπιστρέψας* require an object? And, if so, ought not the translation to be, 'And you, when you have converted your brothers, strengthen them'? R. E. Lee.

Nowshera, India.

Psalm xx. 7: An Exegetical Note.

I had occasion to use this particular passage some time ago, as the basis of a sermon on Religious Confidence. The first clause indicates a 'confidence' in material things—horses and chariots—a confidence in things which do not remain. They are of the fleeting things of Time, and which, when useless, are difficult to replace. They satisfy man's physical requirements—perhaps in a very illusive way they appear to satisfy what he is intent to call higher matters of life—but the illusive nature of that idea leaves man in the end the victim of disappointment.

Viewed together, the former clause implies more than the other. The use of the terms 'trust' and 'remember' are not analogous. Unhappily the writer of the Psalm uses the word 'remember,' which, in the present writer's opinion, is not satisfactory nor adequate for the truth he wishes to express. The word I would suggest ought to be used here is one which enlightens the whole passage considerably — 'confidence.' It certainly does imply more than 'remembrance,' and dims the vaunted pride of a 'trust'—'confidence' in material matters as a foundation of progress.

Professor W. E. Addis (see *Peake's Commentary*, 'Psalms,' p. 377) suggests that the note of confidence commences with v.[6], but the use of the word 'remember' in v.[7] is not consonant with the word or note of confidence in v.[6]. It is possible to have the remembrance of the name of God without confidence; but we can never have confidence without or apart from remembrance. It may be, the Psalmist in his prayer reached the note of confidence by a remembrance of God's power, authority, and name, but the use of the term 'remember' in the text does not give a very concrete idea or connexion with the preceding verse. This unfortunate use of the word 'remember'—by the Psalmist himself or some copyist—fails to bring out the idea of confidence which the Psalmist was wishing to imply. He was sure of the trust of some in horses, some in chariots—and if he had used the word 'confidence'—'*we will have confidence in the name of the Lord our God*'—it would certainly have added considerable influence and evidence to the religion and the religious sympathies of that period—the Maccabean Age. If the historicity of the Psalm can be established—as pertaining to the Maccabean Age (Aristoblus, 105–104 B.C.), then we have sufficient evidence to warrant the suggestion—the writer would have implied a more definite religious temperament and spirit in the use of the term 'confidence,' in place of the half vague term 'remember.'

J. R. Birtle.

Barrow-in-Furness.

[Our correspondent's sense of the unsuitability of the Hebrew נַזְכִּיר, 'we will remember,' or 'we will make mention of,' is shared by most modern commentators, who would read נִגְבִּיר, 'we shall be strong,' which is favoured by the LXX *μεγαλυνθησόμεθα*.—Editor.]

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

Protestant Germany is deeply perturbed by the subtly organized and skilfully directed offensive of Roman Catholicism, whose influence in that country appears to be distinctly greater than before the war; and six lectures by various scholars, including the well-known historian Carl Mirbt, dealing in an earnest and vital way with various aspects of this offensive, have been gathered together and edited

by Pfarrer Müller-Schwefe,[1] with the view of rousing the evangelical conscience of Germany. In these lectures there is no unworthy polemic: they all rest on an intimate knowledge of Roman Catholic methods. They explain the appeal of Romanism —its rich symbolism, its power to evoke the sense of the supra-rational, its unremitting care in the training of candidates for the ministry: it also offers to a distracted world a complete system of social ethics, to which evangelical Protestantism cannot aspire, for there cannot be a programme of Love in the sense in which there may be a programme of Law. One of the most fascinating chapters is that which discloses the intense literary activity, by means of which Catholicism aims at the domination of German thought. Catholicism—one writer says—is and means to be a political power. The concluding lecture offers a suggestive contrast between Protestantism and Catholicism, the one with its religion of conscience, the other with its magic sacramentalism; the one with the Cross as *fundamentum*, the other as *ornamentum*. The writers do not despair of Protestantism; it is asserted that the evangelical Church of Germany, for all its difficulties, has emerged from the storms of the revolution, even stronger than before. This is a very significant book, which those in our own land who fear the encroachment of Rome would do well to read with attention.

A careful discussion of the peoples included under the name 'Japheth' in Gn 10 is presented by Dr. Friedrich Schmidtke of Breslau in *Die Japhetiten der biblischen Völkertafel*.[2] The term Japheth, which he connects with the Greek Japetos, comprises the peoples to the north and west of Israel. The chapter which rests upon P and J, and is inspired by a fine universalism, cannot as a whole be earlier than the seventh century, as not till then did Israel become acquainted with some of the peoples named; on the other hand, it must precede the rise of Persia, which is not named. Among many interesting suggestions is that Elishah is an island, Elaioussa, off the coast of Cilicia.

[1] *Moderner Katholizismus* (Verlag von Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; Mk.4.50, Geb. Mk.6).

[2] Verlag Müller und Seiffert, Breslau; Mk.4.50.

In *Prophetische Offenbarung*,[3] Professor D. Johannes Hänel crosses swords with the Old Testament scholars who regard the prophets as mere ecstatics or moralists or politicians or men gifted with the power of presentiment. In his endeavour to penetrate the secret of the prophetic consciousness he comes to the conclusion that the prophet is distinct from other men in that his soul is filled with a unique energy, of which the ultimate cause is God, who, as it were, effects in him a new creation, without, however, any breach of the law of causality. But there is nothing mechanical in this view of the prophetic inspiration: these ambassadors of God, like earthly ambassadors, are free to act independently and on their own responsibility in the interests of the God who commissioned them. It is worth noting that, according to Hänel, dreams occupy a greater place in the prophetic conception of revelation than is commonly supposed by those who allow themselves to be misled by the sharp polemic against false dreams.

The *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*[4] contains an article in French on the seventeenth chapter of Genesis by Eduard Naville in which he argues that the 'Jahweh' of the opening verse, which certainly looks strange in a chapter universally ascribed to P, is original and not an interpolation. 'Jahweh said, I am אל שדי,' which is rendered by the LXX—Naville thinks correctly —ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεός σου. If the LXX translation is correct, there is no meaning in the phrase, unless the proper name of the God, *i.e.* Jahweh, has preceded it. The argument, of course, is used to prove that even in this so-called P chapter Yahweh makes a covenant with Abraham, and calls Himself his God, *i.e.* long before Moses, to whom according to P, if the critics are to be trusted, the name Yahweh was first revealed. Naville's real aim is to discredit the documentary theory, but that theory is based on too broad and solid a foundation to be so easily demolished.

JOHN E. McFADYEN.

Glasgow.

The second part (ἀπαύγασμα to γνῶσις), the third part (γνώσις to ἐκχωρέω), and the fourth part (ἐκψύχω to εὐχαριστία) of Professor Walter Bauer's revision of E. Preuschen's *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (Töpelmann; geh. 3 M. each) confirm the assurance of the first part that the student of

[3] Verlag von Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; 80 Pf.

[4] 1926, Heft ii. (Töpelmann, Giessen).

the New Testament who has access to this dictionary will be thoroughly equipped for his work on the linguistic side. In large measure it serves the purpose of a commentary. Thus the note on τὸ εἰδωλόθυτον explains how the problem of sacrificial food arose for the Christian; and that the use of the simple vocative of γυνή indicates no want of respect is proved by quotations from authors from Homer downwards. Some of the main features of the work have been already indicated, such as the inclusion of proper names, indication of the earliest author in whose works the word is found, the fact that quotations as well as references are given and that quotations are translated into German, the free use of papyri and inscriptions and the extension of the work to cover early Christian literature as well as the canonical books. The article on εἰς, which covers nearly five long columns, will serve as an illustration of the thoroughness of the work. The discovery of a non-Christian parallel to ἐπιούσιος (in the Lord's Prayer) shows that it was not a word coined by the Evangelist, but does not solve the problem of its meaning. Rather surprisingly Professor Bauer accepts δευτεροπρωτῳ in Lk 6^{1} and explains it as formed on the analogy of 'second-last,' and as being a technical term of the Jewish calendar. Mt 26^{26} he translates without comment: 'This signifies my body.' A valuable feature of the work lies in the references to modern discussions of the words.

The learned and elaborate work on *Die Religion des Judentums in neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, by the late Professor Wilhelm Bousset (second edition, 1906), has now been revised by Professor Hugo Gressmann of Berlin and published in a third edition (1926) under the title of 'Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter' as volume xxi. of Hans Lietzmann's well-known 'Handbuch zum Neuen Testament' (Tübingen: Mohr; single volume, M.15; or M.16.50 bound).

The reviser claims that Bousset's work forms an essential supplement to the otherwise indispensable Schürer (Klausner's translator has just been telling us that Schürer uses only a small fragment of the available Rabbinic material, and that his use of much of that is open to criticism). Dr. Gressmann considers that in essentials subsequent work has corroborated Bousset's attitude to the historical question; consequently, as a rule, far-reaching alterations in the text have not been found necessary, except in the introductory and concluding chapters. The reviser's main task has been to bring up to date the work itself and the bibliography (as in the additions to the appendix on recent literature after the Introduction), to bring out some of Bousset's points more clearly, to modernize the German, and, with the help of others, to verify the references.

J. F. McFadyen.

Kingston, Ontario.

The Social Problem on the Continent.

As in Great Britain so on the Continent, the Great War has so aggravated evil social conditions as to make the sense of the Social Problem much more acute. The Churches are becoming more sensitive in conscience as regards their social responsibility; and the increasing internationalism in thought and work among the Churches is very directly and potently affecting their attitude in all these questions. The influence of Great Britain in these international social interests is a growing one. The Stockholm Conference of 1925 was preceded by what is known as *Copec* in Birmingham in 1924; and it was generally acknowledged that the later Conference owed a great deal to the earlier. While Copec was a national conference, there were a number of continental guests, among them the most conspicuous leader at Stockholm, the Archbishop of Upsala. One of these visitors, a young German theologian, has offered a record and an estimate of Copec to his countrymen.[1] With the thoroughness which characterizes German work, he thinks it necessary in his introduction to compare *Deutschtum und Engländertum*, and *Luthertum und Calvinismus*. His conclusion from the first comparison is 'that, despite great contrast in many things, nevertheless there does exist a real affinity in the English character to the German, if one only searches deep enough' (p. 29). He regards Lutheranism as the dominant, but not the exclusive, factor in German Christianity, and Calvinism in English. His comparison of the two religious types in these distinctive national expressions leads him to assert that 'neither Lutheranism nor Calvinism is the ideal form of Protestantism. Accordingly, Protestantism can only then reach the revelation of its true nature, and the fulfilment of its mission, when Lutheranism and Calvinism work together. This alone is the way to the true unity of the Church of Christ' (p. 39). No foreigner, however sympathetic, can interpret the character or faith of a people with entire

[1] *Soziales Christentum in England*: Geschichte und Gedunkenwelt der Copec Bewegung, von Justus Ferdinand Laun (Im Furche-Verlag. Berlin, 1926. M.4.80).

accuracy; and now and then the author shows a real misunderstanding of some of our conditions. He has, however, not only attempted, but has also succeeded in large measure in being generously appreciative.

In the first part of his book he attempts a contribution to the history of the Copec Movement. He traces it to two other movements, the movement towards Christian Reunion, and the Christian Social Movement, regarding both of which he has taken pains to inform himself; and he then gives a sketch of the movement itself. In a second chapter in this part he discusses the origin of the movement in the history of the Church, first as that is presented in the literature of the movement, and then as it presents itself to himself. The fundamental element is the distinctive type of English Christianity, which grows out of five roots: Catholicism as transformed in Anglicanism; the combined influence of Luther and Wyclif, which has little importance, and has been absorbed into Calvinism, of which Puritanism is the result; the Anabaptist movement of the Continent, producing radical sects, but continued especially in the Baptist Churches; and the mystical spiritualism of the Quakers (see page 85). The Protestant element and then the Catholic element in Copec are analysed. Here one cannot but feel that the author becomes too subtle in his discrimination and derivation of this or that feature in the movement. From his analysis he draws the conclusion: 'That in Copec both the decisive Protestant and the decisive Catholic elements of English Christianity have had an influence. Therewith we can affirm that Copec is a movement which has grown out of genuine English Christianity, the roots of which can be traced to the beginnings of the time of the Reformation' (p. 103).

The second part is for English readers of less interest and value as it is little more than a summary of the Reports of the Commissions and sometimes only a translation of their conclusions; but it will no doubt appear to many German readers as showing a boldness, not to say rashness, of judgment in the English Churches on many social questions, far in advance of German opinion. It is a pity that in this part he has not himself offered a critical estimate.

In his conclusion the author tries to show the significance of the Copec movement. Appreciating highly the purpose and the result of the movement, he at the close asks if it does not need as an element for its sufficiency for its task a contribution which Lutheranism alone could make; but he is doubtful whether it is prepared to make. His last sentences are worth quoting: 'Why does German Lutheranism always stand aside? Instead of looking down with contempt on the Anglo-Saxon Calvinistic striving, it should exactly recognize its own weakness in what that movement has in excess—social activism—and be ready to serve that with what is granted to it as a gift of grace; the wrestling with the ultimate questions, over which Anglo-Saxon Calvinism spite of all earnestness has perhaps passed too rashly. Lutheranism seems to be called to co-operate in the great cultural task of the future, Lutheranism and Calvinism—as Catholicism and Protestantism—and Germans and Englishmen—as Germans and Frenchmen—are directed toward one another and must work together, if we are not all to go down in ruin. To contribute to the mutual understanding necessary for this purpose, has this book been written' (p. 140). For the same reason do I call the attention of English readers to this German book, and commend it to their appreciation. It may be added that the meeting of the Continuation Committee of the Stockholm Conference at Berne, in August, gave encouragement for the hope that this co-operation will not be lacking, and that German Lutheranism will abandon its isolation.

In this connexion mention may also be made of a lecture by Dr. Adolf Keller on *The Social Renewal of Mankind through Christianity*,[1] in which the same appeal is made. Why it is necessary on the Continent to have Protestant Trades Unions is shown in a booklet by Jacob Haas.[2] The reason is that the general trades unions are both socialistic and often even anti-Christian. Our happier position in this country is due to the fact that both the State and the Christian Churches have taken up a much more reasonable and sympathetic attitude to the aspirations of the working classes than has been general on the Continent. Such a publication as *Evangelisch Sozial*, which I receive quarterly, proves that forward-looking men in the German Churches are labouring for the reconciliation of the Church and Labour. So vast is the Social Problem, that all the Christian Churches in Britain, America, and the Continent must co-operate in its solution. And as the author of the book here reviewed appeals to his German fellow-countrymen, so would I appeal to mine in Great Britain; let us take our full share in this international social movement.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

[1] This appeared in *Die Eiche*, 3 Vierteljahr, 1926.

[2] Die Gewerkschaftsbewegung; deren Wesen und Aufgaben (A. Bock, Thur, 1926).

Entre Nous.

What Christ Means to Me.

Many will have read in 'The British Weekly' the articles of Grenfell of Labrador. They have now been published with the title *What Christ Means to Me* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net). When Dr. Grenfell was asked to put on record what Christ meant to him he might have made a statement of his faith and left it at that, but he has chosen a more conclusive way. It is to take his own life and to try to analyse it 'as better evidence than any mere statement of what Christ has meant to one human being.'

In boyhood days Christ was a companion. At school Christ was 'a very silent partner in the life of us English boys . . . but He was a very real companion of many of us all the same.' Later, when we look at what Grenfell 'lived by' in Labrador, we see what Christ meant to him then. It was through his chief, the late Sir Frederick Treves, that Dr. Grenfell's mind first turned to the Deep Sea Fisheries, and it was in 1891 that he visited those on the Newfoundland Banks and began his arduous work, which entailed so much material privation. Here are his own statements of what Christ meant to him then and later.

'Christ means to me the best kind of a Friend, as well as Leader, Who is giving me in this world ten times, nay the proverbial hundred fold, as good times as I could enjoy in any other way. Christ's religion to me is primarily for this world, and the New Jerusalem is to come down from Heaven on to this earth and we are to be the Washingtons and Nelsons. We are to save that city—and we are to have all the fun of really creating it. If Crœsus and Midas, Bacchus and the Satyrs, have the fun of life here, then the philosophy of the East is right. Life is hell: and Nirvana and nothingness is Heaven. If Christ is right and life is a field of honour, and Sir Galahad and Nathan Hale and Edith Cavell got the real fun out of it, then to every red-blooded man life becomes Heaven in proportion as they seize its opportunites for service.'

'Christ means to me that this world has the potential in it of a Kingdom of God.' 'He means that we are the sons and heirs of the Maker of this marvellous cosmos and are the channels upon it of His Kingdom to be.'

'The Christ I visualized is inconspicuous for all absolutely unnecessary differences. He would wear no jewellery of fabulous value any more around His neck than in His nose. No ostentatious show of any kind was His. He hated titles, separating man from man. Leadership in everything that was of value for body, soul, and spirit was His. He was the last on earth to be anything snobbish. He was the Captain of the team, the Solon of scholars, the most modest and unobtrusive in social life. He loved play and work as well as worship. I could not love a Christ as divine Who did not. So for me the interpretation of Christ has had to aim at all that.'

'Christ means to me a living personality to-day who moves about in this world, and who gives us strength and power as we endure by seeing Him Who is invisible only to our fallible and finite human eyes; just as any other good comrade helps one to be brave and do the right thing. Faith was essential for that conviction fifty years ago. To-day with telephones and radios and X-ray, and our knowledge of matter as only energy, and now with television within our grasp, there is not the slightest difficulty in seeing how reasonable that faith is. "The body of His Glorification" passed through closed doors, so the Apostles said—well, why should I be able to see it any more than I can see an ultra-violet or an ultra-red ray or molecule, an atom, an electron or a proton? All that those old fellows claimed was that "now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face."'

Work.

'Work is the only salvation of what is good in man.'

'Christ has become to me to mean more and more *doing* something, anything, well.'

'Following Christ is a hard task. It is a warfare. But He teaches me increasingly that life is worth while if and only as we make its goal "well done" and not "well comprehended."'[1]

General William Booth enters into Heaven.

Lectures, if they are good, on the religious message in modern poetry are sure of an audience. Dr. Hugh Thomson Kerr, the pastor of Shadyside Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, has chosen poems by Walter De La Mare, Richard Le Gallienne, Francis Thompson, Alice Meynell, Gilbert K. Chesterton, Alan Seeger, Rudyard Kipling, Vachel Lindsay, William Ernest Henley, and others, and has analysed them in order to bring out their gospel

[1] W. T. Grenfell, *What Christ Means to Me.*

message. Perhaps some of the poems chosen are rather well known, but they were suited to Dr. Kerr's first purpose—to reach the large invisible audience of listeners-in. But some of the poems are very little known. Have you read, for instance, that one of Vachel Lindsay, 'General William Booth enters into Heaven'? Here are five of the verses and, briefly, what Dr. Kerr has to say of their message.

'Lindsay presents to us first of all a great preacher of redemption. General William Booth belongs to that multitude which no man could number, but he was also born to lead . . . and leadership is suggested in the opening word of Mr. Lindsay's poem . . .

Booth led boldly with his big brass drum.
Are you washed in the blood of the Lamb?
The saints smiled gravely, and they said,
"He's come."
Are you washed in the blood of the Lamb?

The words suggest the man and the message which he proclaimed. There was a note of heroism in the gospel which he preached.

Booth died blind, and still by faith he trod,
Eyes still dazzled by the ways of God.
Booth led boldly and he looked the chief:
Eagle countenance in sharp relief,
Beard a-flying, air of high command
Unabated in that holy land.
Jesus came from out the Court-House door,
Stretched His hands above the passing poor.
Booth saw not, but led his queer ones there
Round and round the mighty Court-House Square.

'It is a great picture of the redeemed. William Booth led a multitude of redeemed souls into the very presence of God. He did not go before the throne of God empty-handed. . . .

Walking lepers followed, rank on rank,
Lurching bravos from the ditches dank,
Drabs from the alleyways and drug-fiends pale—
Minds still passion-ridden, soul-powers frail!
Vermin-eaten saints with mouldy breath,
Unwashed legions with the ways of death—
Are you washed in the blood of the Lamb?

'It is a strange company. No more strange crowd was ever gathered under one banner.

Yet in an instant all that blear review
Marched on spotless, clad in raiment new.
The lame were straightened, withered limbs uncurled,
And blind eyes opened on a new sweet world.

What is the meaning of it all? It means that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. It means that the Lord Jesus Christ still does what He once did.

'It is a picture of the Redeemer. It is not the great multitude which no man can number which crowds the canvas. It is the Lord Himself upon whom the central light falls; it is General Booth's Saviour and not General Booth that fills the poet's page.

And when Booth halted by the curb for prayer
He saw his Master through the flag-filled air.
Christ came gently with a robe and crown
For Booth the soldier while the throng knelt down;
He saw King Jesus—they were face to face,
And he knelt a-weeping in that holy place.
Are you washed in the blood of the Lamb?'

The title of the volume is *The Gospel in Modern Poetry* (Revell; $1.50).

Balanced Burdens.

The Rev. Stuart Robertson, M.A., has gained a great reputation, and rightly so, as a preacher to boys and girls. His latest volume has much excellent application to conduct and it is full of stories, and they are good stories too. The one which gives the volume its title—*Balanced Burdens* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net)—is this. Mr. Robertson has a friend who is a missionary amongst the Indian Santal tribe. 'One day my friend was expecting a visitor, a brother missionary, and he sent a Santal to meet him and bring on his luggage. So the Santal took his carrying pole and set off.

'At the station he found that the luggage consisted of one heavy bag. Now he couldn't divide that burden into two, as was his custom, and plainly he couldn't carry the bag hanging from one end of his carrying pole.

'This is how he solved the problem. He looked about till he found a stone about the same weight as the bag, hung that from one end of the pole and the bag from the other, and walked proudly home with his double burden! His easy way was to carry twice as much. He balanced the one burden with another, and carried the two when he only need have carried one.

'It seems funny, even stupid, doesn't it? Well, it may be funny, but it isn't stupid.

'It is easier to carry two bags than one, *because they balance.*'

But readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES have little need to have Mr. Robertson commended to them, for they have already read a number of his sermons. Two of those which are now given in this volume first appeared in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. But we cannot have too much of Mr. Robertson, and so we have taken one from his new volume, and you will find it in *Virginibus Puerisque*.

The Merchant Adventurers.

Mr. William Canton was the historian of the Bible Society, and in this capacity he wrote the authoritative history of it; a work which ran to five volumes. But he was also a poet and the author of those delightful books of children's sayings that so endeared him and W. V. to the hearts of the last generation of English readers. All his qualities of accurate recording, of historical imagination, of poetic expression, and of humour appear in *Yesterday, To-day, and For Ever* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). It is his last book, for Mr. Canton, at the age of eighty, passed away just as it was finished. He was asked to go through the annals of the Bible Society and write some account of the incidents which he found there, with the hope that 'a wider and more serious reading of the Word of God' might be encouraged. The writing is so admirable that the reader is drawn on from chapter to chapter. In 'Fire and Sword,' he shows that the testimony of the martyrs has not ceased. Amongst the incidents retold in this chapter is that of the martyrdom in 1849, in Madagascar, of four persons of noble birth. It was unlawful to shed their blood, and they were sentenced to be burnt alive at Faravohitra, at the northern edge of the plateau on which Tananarivo stands.

'It was a day of flying showers and bursts of sunshine. On the way to execution, says the native account, "the Christians sang the hymn beginning 'When our hearts are troubled,' each verse ending with 'Then remember us.' Thus they sang on the road."

'Two of the four were husband and wife, and the woman was near the hour of motherhood. "And when they came to Faravohitra, there they burned them, fixed between split spars," with more wood heaped about them. As the faggots kindled, the woman's child was born. No hand of pity was reached out to save it. "And there was a rainbow in the heavens at the time, close to the place of burning"—so close, indeed, that the end of the bow seemed to rest on the martyrs, a marvellous sight, at which some of the spectators fled in terror.

'"They sang again, even while in the fire. Then they prayed, saying, 'O Lord, receive our spirits, for Thy love to us has caused this to come to us; and lay not this sin to their charge.' Thus they prayed, as long as they had any life. Then they died, but softly, gently; gentle, indeed, was the going forth of their life. And astonished were all the people around who beheld the burning of them there."'

There are chapters on the adventures of the Bible men, those merchant adventurers who went into the inaccessible places of the world. But it would not be Mr. Canton if the book was without humour, so we have a chapter on the wit and wisdom of the colporteur. It is difficult to quote from it because one story follows another in the author's own inimitable way, but this is one: 'Here in Korea, where once women used to have no names of their own, and when there was a crowd the street was white, not black, with people, Kim the Korean goes about with his delightful assistant Skylark, a donkey who pretends to eat books. Kim offers his Gospels, and if a man will not buy a copy, "Why, look here!" cries Kim, passing the book to Skylark, who takes hold of it at once with his lips; "this donkey is wiser than you are; *he* takes what is offered him." And as a rule the man laughs and pays for a copy.'

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'Prepare to meet thy God.' How often have these words been used, and used with effect, as the basis of an evangelistic appeal. They have been taken as a call to the individual, a solemn reminder of the necessity of preparation for that great meeting of the individual soul with God which takes place at death. This is the topical use of the words: and if this use of them has been effective, as it undeniably has been, in awakening individual souls to a sense of the seriousness of life and of death, who shall say that such a use is entirely illegitimate? It is possible to believe in the expository method of preaching without worshipping it or regarding it as the only legitimate method. Preaching fulfils itself in many ways.

Still, it is always worth the preacher's while—and if he be conscientious, he will regard it as his duty—to see what his text actually means as well as what it says; and, when he does this, he will often find that it means something other, and frequently something better, than what he wants to make it say. Amos concludes his appeal to prepare with the words 'O Israel'; from which it is evident that the appeal is addressed not to the individual but to the nation, and that the experience in which the meeting with God is to take place is not the solemn experience of death but some catastrophe even more terrible than the locusts and the drought and the other disasters just enumerated which have already fallen upon the nation, and which, terrible as they were, have not had the effect of bringing the foolish people back to their senses and their God.

Three points emerge from the text with startling clearness—the people to whom the appeal is addressed (Israel); the God whom the prophet invites his people to prepare to meet; and the preparation necessary on the part of such a people for a meeting with such a God.

---

(1) In the first place the prophecy itself furnishes the most vivid description of the people to whom the appeal is addressed; and as we read the book—and, with the exception of Jonah, hardly any prophetic book is easier to read—we are amazed to find how exact is the parallel between that ancient civilization and our own. Like ourselves before the Great War, Israel had been enjoying the fruits of many years of comparative peace. The people were 'at ease in Zion,' sheltered behind the fancied security of their mountains, as we behind defences of another kind. During that era of relative peace many evil things had reared their ugly heads.

There was, first of all, intemperance. Over and over again Amos comes back to this, evidently with the feeling that few things had cursed, weakened, and degraded his people more than this. There was drinking at the services in the country churches, and with the drinking was associated immorality ($2^{7f.}$), there was drinking—out of bowls—in aristo-

cratic homes (6^6), drinking to which the women were as addicted as the men (4^1); and the drink was paid for by money secured through the exploitation of the poor (4^1). Of course in such a country as Israel it was inevitable that protests should be offered: there were Nazirites to whom drink was anathema, but their protests went for nothing or were even answered by violence ($2^{11f.}$).

Love of pleasure was the order of the day. Of extraordinary vividness is the passage which draws aside the curtain and lets us look into the 'palaces' which Amos, shepherd that he was and believer in the simple life, detests (6^8)—the luxurious homes where we see the princes of wealth and fashion and the great political leaders lolling indolently on sofas inlaid with ivory, lovers of rich food and drink, scented with the finest perfumes, enlivening their banquets with music and song, but caring nothing at all when their people were broken, as people can be broken no less terribly by the vices of peace than by the shattering blows of war (6^{4-6}).

Further, their commercial life was honeycombed with dishonesty. The merchant princes, especially the great corn-merchants, used 'tricky balances'; they sold underweight, charged exorbitant prices, and even what they sold was adulterated, so that the people were trebly robbed ($8^{5f.}$). It is no surprise to learn that those who cheated their people on the Monday had already cheated their God on the Sunday, and longed with undisguised longing for the passing of the holy day (8^5). 'Shall not the land tremble for this?' says the prophet. A land in which such things can be done is no safe place to live in; it reels and rocks, for its foundations are unstable.

All this rampant materialism had its counterpart in indifference to spiritual things. The people might go to church, but they cared nothing for what the preacher had to say. There were men like Amos, God's best gifts to any people, who in His holy name challenged all those abominations, but the mouths of these men were stopped ($2^{11f.}$ 7^{13}). To such a people the intemperance and the immorality and the profiteering were vastly more congenial than the stern voice of the prophet. Such was the people, then, at whom Amos hurled his message to prepare: it will hardly be denied that with such a people there was much need of preparation.

---

(2) Next let us see what is the character of the God whom this unprepared people has to meet? He is, first of all, a God who hates all those things that His prophet has been denouncing. He not only hates them, but He will not tolerate them. 'Shall not the land tremble for this?' What Amos has in mind is the staggering blow of war. A nation would come and afflict the sinful people from one end of the land to another (6^{14}) with the horrors of a war from whose battles only one in ten would escape (5^3).

To a people who had been assiduously serving their God with the most gorgeous and elaborate ritual it could devise such a message was nothing less than incredible. Besides, could they not plead privilege? Were they not the elect people? Had Jehovah not chosen them out of all the families of the earth (3^2), and was He not therefore bound, as much for His own honour as for theirs, to defend His own beloved Hebrew empire? Assuredly, says Amos, they had been chosen; but the giddier the height, the more fearful the fall. God is no respecter of persons: 'you only have I chosen, therefore I will punish you.' What a heretical and blasphemous conclusion! But Amos means what he says; and what he says is that Israel is no dearer to Jehovah than the dark-faced men of Africa (9^7). The consequences of sin are inevitable and inexorable, and from them there is no escape, even though they should succeed in hiding themselves in heaven or in the bottom of the sea ($9^{2f.}$). All that an unrepentant people can hope for is to be torn in pieces (5^{19}). Things are what they are, and their consequences will be what they will be: why should they deceive themselves?

It is a very terrible gospel, and the conception of God which it envisages, if it were really exhaustive, is one from which the most careless heart might well recoil. But there is more in Amos

than that. Even the darkest passages are lit with flashes, lightning flashes, of the love of God. The refrain of the sombre poem which describes the manifold disasters that had fallen upon the people, runs, 'Yet ye did not return unto me' (4$^{6-11}$). These fearful blows were struck not in vengeance, but in love, to awaken in the people a serious mind and to bring them back to the God from whom they had strayed too pitifully far. So the God whom the people have to meet is at once a God of wrath and of love.

(3) How might they have prepared to meet Him? There were two ways—the false way of ritual, and the true way of morality. Within the congenial sphere of ritual—'for that is what *you* like, ye children of Israel' (4^{5})—these people were Jehovah's devoted servants (4$^{4f.}$). But unhappily for them, that was not what Jehovah wanted at all. No true preparation for the dread meeting was possible along that line. It was conduct and character, not ceremonial, for which the God whom Amos worshipped cared.

The true preparation for meeting Him would have been at once negative and positive. Negatively, it would have involved the abolition of all those public and private sins so scathingly exposed by the prophet—the love of drink and pleasure, the shady commercial transactions, the exploitation of the poor. It would have involved a policy of prohibition of these and similar offences, enacted and enforced by the public and the private conscience.

Positively, the programme of preparation is stated with sublime simplicity in the all-embracing words, 'Seek good, and not evil'; or still more profoundly, 'Hate the evil, and love the good' (6$^{14f.}$). 'Seek good, and not evil, and *so*'—on those moral terms and on no other—'shall Jehovah be with you.' But what is good? 'Establish justice,' says Amos in the same context—that at any rate is good; while the using of men and women as instruments to minister to our greed or lust—that is of the devil. Justice, fair play, as between man and man, and class and class, is good. This aspect of the programme of preparation is summed up in the golden words of 5^{24}, 'Let justice roll down like water,' cleansing every avenue of social and political life, 'and (social) righteousness like a perennial stream' which never runs dry but flows on and on, whatever be the political weather.

If it be objected that this is a moral and not a religious programme, the retort is easy. Amos, like all the writers of the Old Testament, finds the inspiration of morality in religion. If he says, 'Seek good, that ye may live' (5^{14}), he also says, 'Seek God, and ye shall live' (5^{6}), and the latter is as truly a part of his gospel as the former; indeed, to him neither would be conceivable without the other. Morality is lifeless without religion, and real religion must express itself through social morality.

Amos is not an agitator. His motto is not, 'Down with the aristocrats,' or down with anybody; it is 'down with yourselves upon your knees before the high God whom you have offended.' His motto is 'Return unto me' (4$^{6-11}$). This is his message to the democracy of to-day—that, without the recognition of God, no noble or permanently peaceful society is possible. Men can only be brothers in a family the Father of which is God. 'Seek first,' said a greater than Amos, 'the kingdom of God, and all these things,' which men need, 'shall be added unto you.'

A few months ago in these columns we noticed 'The Platonic Tradition in English Religious Thought,' by Dean Inge. The most recent Bampton Lectures—*The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, by the Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D. (Longmans; 12s. 6d. net)—are a direct challenge to the main thesis of Dean Inge. Whereas he tends to say that salvation is of the Greeks, Dr. Rawlinson is convinced that salvation is of the Jews.

That at a very early stage the disciples of Jesus ceased to think of themselves only as disciples,

and adopted towards Jesus an attitude of religious dependence amounting to virtual or actual worship, is beyond question. The point at issue between the school that Dr. RAWLINSON represents and that of Bousset is the question whether this change could have taken place upon Jewish soil or within the circle of the original disciples. Dr. RAWLINSON takes issue with Bousset's explicit denial of 'the existence of any *cultus* of Jesus within the circle of the original disciples, or of any sense, on the part of the original Jewish Christian community, of present communion with Christ.'

For the Bampton lecturer, the question what could or could not have happened is much less important than the question what *did* happen; and he makes it clear that he has no intellectual presuppositions that make it impossible for him to accept the New Testament account. 'Apart from the recognition of a supernatural factor as having been at work, the beginnings of Christianity are not really to be explained.' The events represented for us by the stories at the end of the Gospels and the beginning of Acts convinced the disciples that the crucified Christ was henceforth exalted in glory at God's right hand, which conviction they expressed in language borrowed from Ps 110.

The religion of the first Jewish Christians was something more than the apocalyptic confidence that the last decisive hour of the world's history was at hand. There was also the more personal element, the conviction that the Messiah was Jesus. The vague apocalyptic Son of Man had become for them a concrete reality, Jesus their Master and Lord whom they loved and reverenced and whose return they were expecting. He was also for them the prophet 'like unto Moses,' and the Messianic interpretation of this phrase from Dt 18^{15} seems to have begun with Christianity.

Further, and this is one of the points round which the controversy centres, it is not reasonable to doubt that already, in the language of Christian devotion, for the first Christians Jesus was 'Maran,' 'our Lord.' It was not in Greek-speaking Christianity that this title originated, but in the original Aramaic-speaking Church. Analysis of the Synoptic Gospels seems to show that in the earliest records Jesus is not spoken of as Kyrios (Lord). For this, two explanations are possible. Bousset's inference is that, in the earliest period of the life of the Church, Kyrios was not known as a title for Jesus. The other, and surely the more feasible, explanation is that, at the time when even Mark's Gospel was composed, Jesus was the Lord of the Church; but Christians knew that the title was an anachronism as applied to Jesus in the days of His flesh. Their avoidance of the word is a testimony to the reliability of the records.

The Achilles' heel of Bousset's theory is the Aramaic prayer formula, *Marana tha*, which Paul quotes (1 Co 16^{22}) in warning against his Judaistic opponents. Apparently Jesus was sometimes called Rabbi, and there is evidence from the Talmud that a Rabbi was sometimes greeted respectfully as 'my Lord'; but 'Marana tha' must mean 'Come, Lord'; it could not possibly mean 'Teacher, come.'

Jesus claimed to be the Christ, though not the Anointed One of popular expectation; yet the revised ideas of the Messiah taught by early Christianity, the idea, for example, that the victory of the Elect Champion of the people of God should be gained only through suffering and apparent defeat, at the price of a cup of anguish and of a baptism of blood, though they were never made explicit in Judaism, were nevertheless essentially Hebraic.

The term 'Our Lord' as applied to Jesus indicated the absolute allegiance of His followers. Since Kyrios translates Jahweh in the Septuagint, the application of the term to Jesus facilitated the belief in His Divinity. But, since in the Gentile world there were gods many and lords many, there were certain dangers in applying to Jesus this term which the Hellenized pagans used for the central figure in their cults. There was need for the work of such a convinced monotheist as Paul. Two very different views, however, are taken of the work which Paul actually accomplished in the

shaping of early Christianity. On the one hand, we are told that his mission was primarily to promote the Hellenization of Christianity. On the contrary, Dr. Rawlinson believes that by his emphasis on the love, the redemptive activity, and the ethical righteousness of the one true God, he safeguarded for ever the Hebraic inheritance of our religion.

We are now accustomed to be told that, whether the change was made by Paul or was only adopted by him, the Christ of Paul was vitally different from the original Jewish Christ. Whereas Jesus had proclaimed the coming of the Kingdom, Paul taught the cultus of the present, glorified Lord; the place of the proclamation of repentance was taken by the teaching of a metaphysical change of the old man into the new man; for the direct relation of the soul to God was substituted the Divine grace of a Redeemer, physically mediated by the sacraments on the model of the pagan mystery cults; and the ethical call to save one's life by losing it was replaced by the pagan notion of union with a dying and rising God.

Yet, according to Paul's own judgment, Christianity was no new religion, but simply Judaism with its centre of gravity shifted in consequence of the new era. Paul applied to Jesus terms such as 'Son of God' and 'Lord' that the Greek could understand; he offered Christianity as a religion not only of future hope, but of present redemption; but there is no reason to suppose that from this point of view he would have presented Christianity to Jews under any other aspect. The Jewish Christian, like the Greek Christian, believed that in Jesus Christ God had visited and redeemed His people.

For Paul the Law was in itself holy; it was his heart's desire that Israel might be saved; for him the Gentiles were at best the wild branches of an oleaster grafted into the ancient stock of the true olive tree. Paul was anxious to reach Jerusalem in time for Pentecost; there is significance even in the fact that he had been five times beaten in Jewish synagogues. It is too much to tell us, as Bousset does, that from the moment of his conversion onwards his affinities were wholly with Greek-speaking Christendom.

Again, Paul's teaching on the Atonement is at the antipodes of thought from the Hellenistic idea of an assurance of immortality and of deliverance from trouble as the semi-magical result of initiation into the mysteries of a saviour god. For Paul, Atonement meant the love and the redemptive activity of God. God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, and to such an idea there are no pagan analogies.

For Paul's conception of the Creation as having its beginning in Christ, of Creation as destined to be renewed in Christ, analogies have been sought in the Logos doctrine of Philo, and in the world-soul or world-reason of the Stoics. But in this matter also, Dr. Rawlinson maintains, the foundations of Paul's doctrine are Jewish. As the late Dr. Burney pointed out, in the Book of Wisdom Divine Wisdom is described as God's image, and in the Book of Proverbs it is said of this Wisdom that it was 'begotten' by God 'as the beginning of His way, the antecedent of His works of old.' Apparently the 'Wisdom of God' was one of the first categories under which the Christians thought of Jesus (1 Co 1^{24}). But if Christ is to be identified with the Divine Wisdom, and the functions ascribed to Wisdom in Jewish literature are to be ascribed to Him, materials are already at hand for a very high Christology.

To illustrate: where did Paul get the Christology of Col 1^{15-18}? If Christ is God's Wisdom, and if the Divine Wisdom is the Beginning, then Christ is the Beginning. That at once suggests the phrase in Gn 1^{1}. According to Dr. Burney, the whole passage in Colossians is just an elaborate exposition, according to the kind of exegesis that the Rabbis loved, of the Genesis phrase *bĕrêshîth*. The preposition has three possible meanings: in, by, into. All things, says Paul, were created in, by, and into Christ, who is the *rêshîth*. *Rêshîth*, again, has four possible meanings: the beginning, the sum-total, the head, the first-fruits. In the

Colossians passage, it is claimed that Jesus is the *rêshîth* in each one of these senses.

Even the author of the Fourth Gospel is essentially a Jewish Christian. It was as the Jewish Messiah that the Saviour was crucified. There came a time when the Greeks too would see Jesus; but in the very chapter that tells of this incident (12) the author finds in the ministry of Jesus the fulfilment of prophecies in a psalm (Ps 118), in Zechariah (9^9), in the story of the call of Isaiah, and in Is 53. The Christian claim that in Jesus the true God is revealed is based on the historic claim of the Jewish race to be the repositories of the true revelation of God.

The supreme question for our day is beyond doubt this: Was Jesus Christ the unique Son of God? There are questions raised by science that are important for religion; and there are questions raised by psychology that are of even greater immediate importance. But none of these can compare in urgency with the question of the Deity of Christ. Has God broken through to us in a final and absolute fashion? Is Jesus Christ a Divine ultimatum? The significance of books like Mr. Murry's Life of Christ is that they raise this question again for our minds.

In *The Modern Churchman* for January 1927 there are two articles dealing with this point, one by Mr. H. H. Farmer on 'The Worship of Jesus Christ,' the other by the editor, Dr. H. D. A. Major, on 'The Dynamic of the Incarnation.' They both strive to find an answer to our fundamental question which is positive and true to the facts; and in their own way they both succeed, for they are both helpful to our faith.

Mr. Farmer especially. The question he starts with is this: What basis is there for the distinctively Christian conviction about Jesus Christ, namely, that He is unique in such a way that we are impelled to give Him the obedience and worship and finality for our thought which we should give to God? That is putting the question adequately. Mr. Farmer points out that the answer to it is usually pragmatic. Jesus solves men's problem. He brings their life into harmony. He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. That is to say: faith in Christ *works*.

But how do we get from that to the conviction that God meets us in Him in a quite special way, and to the further conviction that we do right to worship Him as God? There are many people (for example, Unitarians) who admit a revelation of God in Jesus, but they will not worship Him. They admit *an* Incarnation, but not *the* Incarnation. If people reach this lesser view of the value of Christ by the pragmatic way of His value for life, they have to answer the searching question, How am I to know that Jesus will be adequate for everything, not only in my personal life, but in all the history of man? The pragmatic argument cannot lead us to the specific Christian conviction of the Deity of Christ or to the worship of Him.

Mr. Farmer goes further, and says that 'it is doubtful whether in any department of life anybody ever comes to believe anything or continues to believe anything *merely* because on the whole it seems to work and unify experience.' We need what Mr. Farmer calls a *coercive* element in our faith as well as a pragmatic. By this he means that in any genuine apprehension of truth the percipient is conscious of being forced to apprehend what he does apprehend by a reality which in some sense stands over against him and is independent of his mind and the satisfaction of his desires. In some sense the fact or truth has got to 'hit' him so that he has no option but to say 'that is so'; it must shine in its own light and be there in its own right. The pragmatic element is necessary also. We must feel the truth to be a personal good. But the coercive element is just as essential. Man's nature is such that truth must lay hold of him by its own inherent cogency and force.

Now apply this to Jesus. The worship of Him

must be a half-hearted business unless there be that in Him which strikes the mind immediately and coercively into that attitude. Man has the capacity to recognize the presence of God in human life, and worship is the instinctive response of the mind to such a recognition. We can see the true, the beautiful, and the good in this world and realize their absolute value. They are sacred, and in this ethically sacred we recognize God.

Now here is the coercive basis for the place Jesus has in the Christian consciousness. We discern in Him the altogether holy will, the altogether sacred. This is the only means we have of identifying God immediately. Where we meet the altogether holy will we know we meet God. We know intuitively, coercively. God confronts us through absolute value. To have the value of God is to be God. No one would have the value of God unless He is God.

Some people feel a difficulty as regards the Christian conviction about Christ because He lived so long ago, and we know of Him only by scanty records. But if in Jesus there is a complete and adequate unveiling of the Divine character and purpose, in which everything has its being and from which everything derives its meaning, then the lapse of time is irrelevant to the abiding and verifiable significance of Christ. And in proportion as Christ is what Christianity asserts Him to be, in that proportion will He persist in human life and be observable even to-day and in the affairs of our present existence. And you will find in Him the way to peace in our civilization and the solution of the problem of suffering and its relation to sin.

If this be a valid line of thought, it means that by identifying the coercive touch of God upon men's spirits with the sense of the ethically sacred we are given a permanent basis upon which to ground a living conviction about Jesus. And if, in addition to making this immediate coercive impression of the Divine upon us, Christ can in practice produce health of soul and triumph over the world, then the affirmation of His Divinity is as soundly grounded as anything well could be.

Present-Day Faiths.

Modernism in the English Church.

By Professor Percy Gardner, Litt.D., Oxford.

The word Modernism is an ugly hybrid, combining the Latin word *modernus* with the Greek termination *-ism*. Many liberal Churchmen decline to accept it as a label; and one must confess that it is 'soiled with ignoble use.' There is a modernism in manners which it is hard to discriminate from discourtesy, and a modernism in painting which fills the new galleries with abominations. But, of course, in this paper we speak only of Modernism in religion, that is, of the adaptation of Christianity to modern conditions. And, indeed, in use the term is applied only to a particular class of Christians, who, realizing that sometimes the faith of the Christian Church is handicapped by the retention in formula and service of obsolete history, obsolete science, inadequate ethics, are anxiously desirous to set it free from such hindrances.

The appellation Modernist was first applied in two documents of the Roman Church, the decree *Lamentabili* and the encyclical *Pascendi* issued in 1907, to a growing party in that Church, which, led away, as the Papal theologians assert, by pride and curiosity, had fallen into serious heresy. The documents sketch, with great clearness, though naturally not without bias, the views in philosophy and Church history which are at the root of this serious heresy, and which are declared to be false and pernicious.

At the bottom of the philosophy of the Modernists the Papal theologians place 'vital immanentism,'

the tracing of the source of religion to human life and inspiration; in a word, to the religious experience of individuals, whether explicit or subconscious. And at the bottom of Modernist historic views the same authorities place the thesis that the history of Christianity must be sought out by the same faculties and by the same methods as other branches of history. Both of these tendencies are anathema.

The treatment of the history of Christianity in a similar way to the history of Greece and Rome is a tendency which has been for long prevalent in the Universities not under Papal dominion. In this matter Oxford and Berlin, Paris and Florence, the English and the American Cambridge are at one. And it is precisely in consequence of the adoption of this point of view that immense progress has taken place in Christian history. The impossibility of calling a halt, and handing back the history of Christianity to the Roman Curia, was most decisively shown when Monsignor Duchesne, an ardent lover of his Church, and by no means partial to Protestant Theology, was obliged by his intellectual conscience to adopt in his learned Church History similar methods and standards to those which prevail in the colleges of the North and West.

The case is somewhat different as regards vital immanentism. The rules of historic investigation have been evolved by a succession of great writers, and have generally prevailed. But the field of philosophy is not in the same way mapped out and defined. We still have a multitude of schools, hostile one to another, but quite unable to silence one another. For my part, I hold that there is a close relation between the philosophic principle of vital immanentism and Modernist views on Christian history and doctrine; and I have maintained that view in my recent book on *Modernism in the English Church*. But this is no place for a full discussion of profound philosophic questions. And the great majority of Modernists in Great Britain stand very loose to all philosophic systems. It is of them that I have to speak.

The same tendencies of thought which have produced Modernism in the Roman and in the Anglican Church have acted also among Presbyterians and Congregationalists; though among the latter the absence of definite external control has made the movement less obvious and more gradual. The Presbyterians of Scotland have certainly greatly changed their attitude since, half a century ago, Dr. Robertson Smith was expelled from his Professorship for holding too advanced views in regard to the Pentateuch. But in a brief paper like the present I must confine myself within rigid limits: so I shall speak only of the Modernism which is at present a force, a powerful and disturbing force, in the English Church. Some Anglican Modernists would disclaim any relation or any parallelism to the Modernism of men like Loisy and Tyrrell, who were expelled from the Church of Rome at the beginning of the century; but this is to go too far; the same insistent problems lie at the root of both movements, though the solution is different.

There has always been a Broad Church party in the English Church, but towards the end of the nineteenth century it was weak. The leaders of it, Jowett, Stanley, Maurice, and the rest, had passed away. The Ritualists were active and confident, and had seized on the theological colleges. And it must be confessed that the protagonists of the Broad party had no very clear or strong platform on which to erect their theories; it was with them rather a matter of temperament than of reason.

But meantime steady and thorough work on the original documents and the early history of Christianity had been carried on at Oxford and Cambridge and elsewhere. The mantle of Robertson Smith had fallen on Dr. Driver. The enormous labours of scientific theologians on the Old and New Testaments were slowly producing results in England, and had affected even the High Church writers in *Lux Mundi*, to the great disgust of their more conservative friends. Within my memory the character of theological teaching in the University has completely changed, and the field of history is no longer rigidly divided into sacred and profane. The constantly sapping force of historic method has driven the old-fashioned orthodoxy from one post after another. And while brilliant theories and rigidly logical systems in the historic field are appearing and disappearing like meteors, the great body of theological teachers is moving slowly and steadily to new and more defensible ground.

And parallel to the movement in history has been a great movement in science. The idea of development in biology has caused us to take far more interest in origins, and particularly in human origins, social, ethical, and religious. In the last century the rapid growth of science disposed many men to look on religion as an outworn and useless thing, and to expect from our scientists a key to all the problems of the universe. That wave of tendency is mainly spent; the greatest scientific authorities now feel that science can never solve the ultimate problems; that there will always be a

point beyond which it cannot go. Science can give us facts, and teach us laws; but it cannot embark on the problem of values, or show us what we ought to do with our lives. The man of science, like any other man, has duties, personal, social, and political; and, in order to discharge them, is obliged to resort to some kind of religion, even when he prefers to call it by some other name. Beyond the facts of origin and development stand the great values. The man of science also has a soul to be saved, and he very generally finds that he cannot save it without the aid of a spiritual power working in and through the facts of Nature and the lives of men.

A man may, of course, commit the care of his salvation to an organized Church, which will take charge of it, only insisting in return on his obedience. But, if he rejects this facile resource, he finds no other save by plunging into the sea of difficulty in search of the firm land of faith which lies beyond it.

There is no doubt that the steady advance of historic science has been the chief cause of the rise of Modernism. It has affected the whole intellectual atmosphere, so that many who really know very little about it have found themselves obliged to reject much that our fathers had accepted without question. In particular, the attitude of the modern mind towards miracle has become more and more sceptical. Our fathers found no difficulty in believing that for one short period of history, miracles were by Divine overruling permitted, and afterwards ceased; but we now look on the whole course of history as a gradual development, with remarkable crises, no doubt, but still under the rule of law, or, to speak more exactly, under the control of a spiritual Power who works through law.

Even the miracles accompanying the birth and the resurrection of the Saviour, the modern mind, accustomed to find parallel tales through the whole course of ancient history, declines to accept when they are presented as a basis of faith in the Christian religion. It finds a far safer basis in the facts of religious experience recorded in Scripture, and verified day by day in the experience of multitudes.

It is largely because certain miraculous events are insisted on as historic in the Creeds that the Modernists claim to interpret them broadly. But this is not their only difficulty. Such phrases as 'very God of very God,' and 'of one substance with the Father,' ordinary Church people cannot in the least understand. Such phrases seem to them completely unreal. And they are right. Such phrases, which indeed are not confined to the Creeds, but recur in various parts of the liturgy, cannot be understood, and cannot be explained, except in reference to ways of thinking which prevailed in the ancient world, but have long become obsolete. Church-goers cannot understand why such formulæ should not be superseded by direct expressions of religious faith and experience.

There is abroad a notion, which is accepted by many strict Church people, that the Creeds are all-important in the teaching of the English Church. A glance at the Articles of Religion will confute this view. The three Creeds, those Articles say, including the Athanasian, are to be received because they may be proved by Scripture. But this is not in fact the case; therefore this Article must be regarded as one of those which are out of date, in which category several Articles are generally placed. So far as I am aware, no Church has placed the Creeds on a higher level of authority than the New Testament; and the historic and doctrinal statements of the New Testament are freely criticised in the theological lecture-room.

The Church of Rome has authoritatively published her views as to Church history and doctrines, which are to be submissively received by all her members. But in the English Church there is far more liberty; a general assent is all that is required, by the Clerical Subscription Act of 1865.

It would, however, be unfair to speak of the Modernist tendency as merely negative, as leading only to the giving up of some of the beliefs held by our forefathers. It has also a conservative or constructive side. Churchmen, looking at the course of Christian history with the help of psychology, have found that in many cases doctrines which were regarded as set forth by arbitrary ecclesiastic authority are really the expression, probably the imperfect expression, of deep and lasting religious experience. When criticism has done its work, much reconstruction is possible on a basis not of authority, but of fact. This is a process far more difficult than mere criticism, and it must be slow. The rudiments of it are to be found in Robertson's Sermons; and the influence which has been exerted in England by recent works of the German theologians Otto and Heiler shows how the leaven is working.

The notion, sedulously circulated by some of the Church newspapers, that the Modernists are wanting in loyalty to the Church, and dishonest in repeating statements which they do not believe, is unjust and false. There are certain parts of the Liturgy which are distasteful to them, as there are parts

which are distasteful to the High and the Low Church. The English Church is comprehensive, and that is one of her best features; but to be comprehensive she must needs give up a thoroughly logical and systematic character. She aims at being the Church, not of a sect, whether Catholic or Protestant, but of the nation so far as it is attached to the Christian religion, and willing to accept her mode of presenting it. The recitation of prayers and Creeds and the like in Church is a corporate, not an individual act, and it must be taken in the mass. It is easy to imagine the confusion and absurdity which would arise if every individual were determined only to repeat such petitions, or to sing such hymns, as he heartily approved of. Of course, he may be silent if he strongly revolts against the words spoken; but surely in Church we should cultivate a tolerant and generous, not a critical and exclusive, habit of mind.

The Modernists claim to be a loyal element in the English Church. They claim to carry on the tradition of a great party which has always existed in that Church, from the days of Leighton and Cudworth and Butler onwards. And they claim to serve a useful purpose in the Church by acting as officers of *liaison* between it and what is best in modern civilization.

They are by no means well organized. They are a crowd rather than an army, and no one can be called their leader. But at the beginning of the century there arose a danger that clergymen of Modernist tendencies might suffer persecution through the hardening tendencies displayed by some of the Anglo-Catholic leaders. To protect the rank and file of the movement, and to further its influence, there was then formed a society called 'The Churchmen's Union for the Advancement of Liberal Religious Thought.' At first it was weak, and at some of its meetings the spirit of discord was present. But it has rapidly grown in numbers and influence, and is at present the best representative of the Modernist party. It has a monthly organ, ably edited by Dr. Major, the Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford, and called the *Modern Churchman*. It has held every year since 1914 an annual conference, at which some of the great questions in regard to Christianity and the Church are discussed, and the discussions are published in special numbers of the *Modern Churchman*, which circulate widely. But, of course, no decisions are reached. The direction of the policy of the Society is in the hands of a Council, which watches the course of events in the Church, and has sometimes intervened in them with important results. The President at present is Dean Inge.

The objects which the Churchmen's Union sets before itself are eight in number:

1. To affirm the continuous and progressive character of the revelation given by the Holy Spirit in the spheres of knowledge and of conduct.

2. To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to restate her doctrines from time to time in accordance with this revelation.

3. To uphold the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England.

4. To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.

5. To promote the adaptation of the Church Services to the needs and knowledge of the time.

6. To assert the claim of the laity to a larger share in the government and responsible work of the Church.

7. To foster co-operation and fellowship between the Church of England and other Christian Churches.

8. To study the application of Christian principles and ideals to the whole of our social life.

The eighth object has been more recently added in response to the appeal of members, but the Council has always kept it in the background, not because it is of less importance, but for practical reasons. In the first place, there is a multitude of religious societies, of which the so-called *Copec* is the best known, which have worked and are working for this special purpose; it seemed useless to add one to the number. In the second place, the purpose is so vast and so insistent, and so completely occupies our horizon, that if the Society gave special heed to it, it would be drawn away from its original design, which is rather to remove the intellectual difficulties in the way of a renovated Christianity, than to cope with all the evils of our perverted civilization. But this wise abstention is not always respected, and the members of the Churchmen's Union have had over and over again to listen to preachers and moralists, whether of their own number or from outside, who have dwelt on the greater importance of conduct than of thought (which is, in fact, one of the main proofs of the Modernist position), and have spoken with some contempt of the Society as composed of men who have little sympathy with the life of practical religion. The reproach is utterly unjust, as some of our members, and still more of our sympathizers, are prominent in the work of Copec. But there is truth after all in the words, 'Evil is wrought by want of thought as well as want of heart,' and

to clarify and modernize the thought of the Church is, after all, scarcely a less important object than to stimulate the life of practical Christianity.

The Society has already weathered one storm. After one of its conferences, held at Girton in 1921, on the subject of 'Christ and the Creeds,' the papers read at the Conference, and published in the *Modern Churchman*, were delated by the English Church Union to the Convocations of Canterbury and York as containing heresy, and a condemnation of them was demanded. Both Convocations carefully considered the matter, and both declined to sanction the 'denunciation of contributions made by earnest men in their endeavour to bring new light to bear upon' the anxious problems of Christian theology. We may regard this decision as a charter of liberty. And liberty in the face of modern thought is what Modernists desire. But liberty in a wider sense has to be protected; for there is a small but eager party in the Church which would if it could establish a tyranny and narrow the national Church into a rigid sect.

Literature.

THE HINDU VIEW OF LIFE.

Professor S. Radhakrishnan seems to be becoming a kind of official and accredited exponent of Hinduism to the Western world. Apart from his writings, has he not given the Haskell Lectures to the University of Chicago? And here are his Upton Lectures delivered at Manchester College, Oxford—*The Hindu View of Life* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net).

His faith is fortunate in its champion—a man, alert, thoughtful, fair-minded, armed cap-à-pie in the matter of knowledge, and the master of a trenchant style full of the stab of arresting sentences. His book is a defence of Hinduism, a claim that its way is the true way, and its creed the wise creed, and its methods the best even yet for our distracted world. He takes that huge, unwieldy, amorphous mass of contradictions, screaming at each other, the whole babel of it, from the rarefied atmosphere of its abstruse philosophy to the vulgarities of its crudest orgies, and—while now and then gently insinuating an admission of imperfection—boldly defends the lot. His claim is that Hinduism, which at the highest is to him the mode of human thought that has climbed nearest the reality of things, was wisely guided in making provision within itself for all types of minds, down to the very dimmest and least worthy. You must not force the pace of development; to shatter the superstitions of the savage is to shatter his morality; it is futile to stress any one particular metaphysic, and indeed only the half-religious worry about dogma. Live your own better religion, but seize upon crude minds, admit the element of truth in what they see, even though you can't see it, and gradually educate them or their far-off descendants up to higher things. That, he says, has been the guiding principle of Hinduism. And, while he admits that it has worked imperfectly, no other, he is sure, can do as well. That is a view with which we shall find it difficult to agree. The sinister facts of the history of our own religion, the pitiful fashion in which it has been so largely spoiled and baffled by the inrush of lower views and heathen superstitions, brought in by pagan peoples only partly Christianized, stare at us menacingly. And when Smith, the Cambridge Platonist, is quoted, 'Such as men themselves are, such will God Himself seem to him to be.' No doubt. But the whole point of Christianity is to teach us to think of God in terms, not of our own sullen, foolish, sinful selves, but of Jesus Christ. 'This,' says John, laying down his pen, 'is the real God, really seen by us at last.' And for us dogma is not futile. For only the Christian facts possess the power to make the Christian life.

The defence of Hinduism is whole-hearted, at times even audacious: where, for example, we are told of the encouragement in the doctrine of Karma (dogma, it seems, is not so futile after all); or that the Hindu view that every human being has a personality worthy of reverence is slowly spreading at long last over the earth; most of all in a challenging chapter, largely in defence of caste, which runs out into most interesting comments on the world problems of our time. It is a chastening experience to have this thoughtful observer watch us closely, and announce sadly and courteously but with conviction that the ideals of our age are sordid, and our hopes shallow, and our prophets

(Freud, as he instances with truth) mere echoes of what in India is old almost as the hills, that both our demagogues and our idealists are leading us all wrong, that, in short, we seem an earthy and mad and futile generation.

As to his statement of Hinduism, he begins by claiming that all that matters rose in either India or Greece, but seems to make his own faith tenable to the modern world only by eliminating its originality. Māyā, it seems, is not illusion, only the haunting sense that this scene of our gallant human efforts is doomed at last to disappear, it and the fruit of all our sacrifice and toil. And Karma is just heredity and the moral law. And Indian Pantheism is not the thorough thing we fancy it, but just a seemly feeling of God's Immanence. Is Piccadilly Circus God? he asks bluntly. And he answers, No.

The fact is, as that fine scholar Gibb said long ago in one of his prefaces to his Ottoman Poetry, the difficulty for us of the Eastern mind is that it can hold together and without discomfort two contradictories, and does not feel any need of weaving its thoughts into one consistent web. Professor Radhakrishnan seems to be able to hold together his own faith and a fair amount of Christian thinking. But then he feels that the great need for his religion is to restate itself. Is it trying to engulf Christ too? Of course it is. That is its cleverest policy. But it will find that it involves tremendous risks. Pray God, here, too, a little leaven may leaven the whole lump. Meantime here is one thought of many which our age, raucously shouting for this and that, might ponder, 'The higher the man the fewer are his rights and the more numerous his duties.'

THE GALILEAN ACCENT.

It was with good reason that the Rev. Arthur J. Gossip, M.A., was selected a year or two ago to deliver the Warrack Lectures on Preaching. Those lectures showed that he was a master of the art he was invited to expound, and his published sermons more than confirm the impression of mastery created by the Lectures. He can address children with unusual aptness, as readers of The Expository Times well know, but he can address the mature mind with equal power. He has the great qualities of simplicity, insight, fervour, and imagination, without which preaching can never touch the highest levels.

His latest book, *The Galilean Accent* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. net), reveals capacity of many kinds. It is, for one thing, the work of a man widely versed in literature and in the great religions of the world. More than once he draws upon Al Ghazzali, and the mystics, like Juliana of Norwich and Santa Teresa, seem to have a peculiar attraction for him. But all sorts of writers are laid under contribution —Kingsley, Froude, Reade, Emerson, Balzac, etc.—and his allusions to or quotations from them, always brief, are always apt and striking and really contributory to the argument. Everywhere there is evidence of a forceful personality which is not content to tread well-worn tracks. He is not afraid to say, for example, that Stevenson's prayers seem to him to lack the genuine note. The book is the fruit of a ripe experience as well as of much independent thought, and the sorrows and terrors of the War have left their mark upon his soul. The incidental anecdotes are crisply told and always to the point. This is what he says, for example, of those who seem to have died before their time: 'As Moulton put it, thinking about his own dead boy, and only a few weeks before he himself . . . died in an open boat after his vessel was torpedoed, "If our earthly life is only a testing and a training, we need not wonder why there are so many 'premature' withdrawals of bright and promising lives. God does not need the time we need to test a character, nor does He take our view of the importance of a post to which He has set us."'

The sermons are of a thoroughly searching quality. The writer is too earnest to indulge in rhetorical tricks or display; in his words we hear the voice of an earnest Christian man pleading for Christ and the Christian life. For, above all things, this is a Christian book. The theme, whatever it may be, soon leads us round to Christ, and there can be no mistake of the present reality of Christ to Mr. Gossip. The length of the sermons shows how full his mind is of the truth he would drive home and how much he himself is at home in that truth. There is in them all a freshness, a forcefulness, a penetration, and a commanding Christian quality which mark Mr. Gossip as one of the authentic pulpit voices of our time.

MEDIÆVAL HEBREW MINSTRELSY.

To the Jew the Sabbath is a delight, and the nature of the happiness associated with that happy day is revealed by Mr. Herbert Loewe in a delightful volume entitled *Mediæval Hebrew Minstrelsy* (James Clarke; 4s. net), which has the honour of a Foreword by the Chief Rabbi. The volume consists of sixteen Table Songs, which are printed

in the Hebrew (pointed) text and accompanied not only by the music of the Hebrew tunes to which they are sung but by an English translation adapted to those tunes, so that those who are entirely unfamiliar with Hebrew may yet have an accurate idea not only of the spirit but to a large extent even of the letter of the Songs. The Sabbath meal is the home 'at its most perfect hour,' and these songs, sometimes gay and even rollicking in temper, reflect a genial piety which is native to the Jew at his best. Some of the songs date back to the tenth century, some are in Arabic, Italian, and Troubadour metres, and in some the influence of Russian or Polish melodies is discernible. Literary parallels to these songs are discussed in a highly interesting appendix—parallels from the Graces of the Church, from Herrick, from Burns, etc.; and the conclusion of the whole matter is that better than most nations has the Hebrew been able to combine the idea of good cheer that dominates the average drinking song with the idea of thankfulness to God that inspires the hymn. These Table Songs form a beautiful bridge between the secular and the sacred: 'we sanctify our food in song, we do not debase our song in food.' Associated as they are with Queen Sabbath and designed primarily for the Jewish family circle, they will be scarcely less attractive to others who are interested in the history of metre, or melody, or domestic religion. The book is obviously written by one who loves his people and understands their institutions from the inside.

THE RELIGIOUS SITUATION.

The Rev. Principal Edward S. Kiek, M.A., B.D., of the Parkin College, Adelaide, has published a series of lectures which were originally delivered to a Summer School of Theology at Adelaide. The title is *The Modern Religious Situation* (T. & T. Clark; 5s. net). They are well worth reproducing for the public benefit. It would be difficult to name a book of Christian apologetic (for that is what it is) more useful or competent than this one. It is marked by complete sincerity and candour, and shows throughout so firm a grasp of the subject and so easy and resourceful a handling of it that the reader's confidence is entirely won. After a review of 'The Modern Situation' which shirks nothing but offers us some real comfort, the writer goes on to discuss modern difficulties about various fundamentals—the Fatherhood of God, Prayer, the Virgin Birth, the Atonement, the Resurrection, and other matters great and less great. The only omission we notice is a definite and separate treatment of miracle, but that is in some ways the greatest difficulty of all. Many teachers do not know what to make of a narrative like the Feeding of the Five Thousand or the Walking on the Sea. And, of course, that raises the question of the historical trustworthiness of the New Testament record, a subject which also fails to receive separate treatment in the book. But we are thankful for what we get. The orthodox reader will perhaps be disappointed sometimes at Principal Kiek's impartiality. In his treatment of the Virgin Birth, for example, he presents the evidence on both sides fully, but comes to no conclusion. Probably that fairly reflects his own attitude of suspense of judgment. But, at any rate, he gives his reader the material for forming his own judgment. The writer is far from being orthodox in the ordinary sense. He admits that the tradition of the Resurrection became 'materialized' and is willing to suppose that legendary elements have crept in. But in this, as in the main things, his broad conclusion is positive, and his freedom about smaller matters gives us the more confidence in his own final judgment. It is on the whole an admirable book, able, candid, and written in a style that is peculiarly attractive.

THE CROSS OF THE SERVANT.

As a theologian Principal H. Wheeler Robinson combines in high degree two qualities which are rarely found together—he is an accurate exegete, and he is a real thinker: it is this combination that lends peculiar weight to what he has to say on *The Cross of the Servant: A Study in Deutero-Isaiah* (S.C.M.; 3s. net). He rightly maintains that Christian exegesis naturally leads on to Christian theology, and so he is not content with determining whether the Servant in Is 53 and the other three Servant Songs is individual or collective; he sees clearly that the deeper question raised by the chapter is beyond and even independent of this, namely, what is the meaning of the sufferings of the innocent Servant, and in what way do they affect the world? While Dr. Robinson, in common with most modern scholars, defends the collective interpretation of the Servant, one of the distinctive values of his discussion is that he brings out the large measure of truth which lies in the individual interpretation by his careful and suggestive discussion of the idea of corporate personality. By his profound analysis he also shows the essential truth that underlies the idea of vicarious atone-

ment, an idea which, as he says, is in any of its forms apt to encounter keen prejudice. The principle of substitution, which can be presented in a thoroughly repellent and unconvincing form, becomes not only plausible but convincing when it is seen to rest upon a transformed moral relation.

Especially valuable is the chapter on the Messiah-Servant, which reveals the extraordinary influence which the Servant Songs, and in particular Is 53, exercised upon the writers of the New Testament. Besides profoundly determining the consciousness of Jesus, it is seen in two important directions to have affected the mind of Paul. One of these is his insistence on the idea of the Church, which replaces the old Israel. While 'the collective idea contracted into a primary reference to Jesus, yet its virtual presence is seen in the readiness with which it expanded into the doctrine of the Church.' The other direction is revealed in the great Kenosis passage of Ph 2. In this connexion, Principal Robinson, pointing to the similarity between Ph 2^7 and Is 53^{12} ('he emptied out his life to death'), makes the admirable suggestion that the Kenosis here involved refers to the Crucifixion rather than the Incarnation. This is only one of many striking features of a valuable and stimulating discussion which presents an aspect of Christian truth that to-day is frequently ignored or rejected, in a thoroughly reasonable light.

THE PARABLES OF JESUS.

It is not easy to write anything original about the Parables. A gleaner who comes after Trench and Bruce must be industrious indeed and talented to find anything they have overlooked. But, as a matter of fact, if a man has a new point of view, or a special originality or a favourable heredity, or indeed anything of his own that others have not, he will have something fresh to say on anything. And the Rev. N. Levison has brought something of this kind to his exposition of the Parables. He says little about textual or critical questions, and his treatment is not exegetical, like Trench's. He writes to enlighten the ordinary reader, and his special qualifications are his Jewish ancestry and upbringing, and his residence from childhood within sight of Nazareth in the midst of the very scenes Jesus depicted so vividly. This is the main interest and value of the book, and the main aim of the writer, as his title shows—*The Parables: Their Background and Local Setting* (T. & T. Clark; 7s.). Mr. Levison is now a Christian minister, but his heredity and his familiarity with the scenery and background of the stories, and with the *ethos* of the people, make his exposition of real worth. Preachers and teachers especially will find this new book on the Parables really helpful. His chapters will enable them to make their teaching and preaching more vivid and interesting.

A NEW SERIES.

A series of books with the general title 'The Faiths,' and the sub-title 'Varieties of Christian Expression,' has been projected (and begun) by Messrs. Methuen & Co. The general editor is Dr. L. P. Jacks, whose name as a Unitarian is a guarantee of breadth and whose general acumen is a guarantee of efficiency. The series begins with books which are as far apart from one another as possible (the sign and seal of breadth), and written by men admittedly capable of their job (the sign and seal of efficiency). The price of each volume is 5s. net. The first is on *Modernism in the English Church*, and is by Professor Percy Gardner, Litt.D., LL.D., F.S.A. The plan is very simple. We have first a history of the rise and progress of Modernism in the Roman and Anglican Churches. That takes up chapters one to five. Then we read an examination of the critical and psychological basis of the movement. The writer delineates the new conception of history to which science has led us, and shows how this has eliminated miracle from the records. He disclaims any prejudice which would pronounce any miracle as impossible. It is a question of evidence, and he declares, with surprising assurance and dogmatism, that 'it has been shown conclusively that the evidence in the case of miracles properly so called always on close investigation turns out to be inadequate.' This scientific view of history has, however, the writer declares, brought out with new vividness the real greatness of Jesus. So far as the critical and psychological basis of religion is concerned, Modernism strives to preserve the absoluteness of Christianity, and this the writer believes can only be done on activist or pragmatic lines. Some form of absolutist religion is necessary for the human spirit, and it is difficult to vindicate this in view of the historical critical attitude, and still more difficult in view of the conclusions of comparative religion. But Modernism is an attempt at a synthesis which actually does largely achieve this desirable object. It need hardly be said that these propositions are worked out with great ability in the chapters of this book. It is perhaps on too high a level for ordinary people. We have

a really better impression of what Modernism is from Canon Glazebrook's 'Faith of a Modern Churchman,' thin as that book is, and even from Dr. Pryke's rather truculent 'Modernism as a Working Faith.' These books are far inferior to Professor Gardner's in intellectual qualities, but they leave a more definite impression. The only really poor part of this book is its closing review of 'The Present Outlook.' This strikes us as a rather feeble close to a remarkable volume.

The second of the same series is on *The Anglo-Catholic Faith*, and is by Canon T. A. Lacey, D.D. It is an amusing fact that the writers of both the books before us protest that they dislike the name of the system they expound, but accept it with shrugs of resignation. Canon Lacey's book is in its own way as able as Professor Gardner's, but we do not like it as much. Perhaps the best way to explain this is to make two brief quotations. On p. 99 the Canon writes: 'Organization is a matter of externals, and I have said as little as possible about it; but the organic constitution of the Church of Christ is no accident imposed upon the religion of the Gospel. *It is an integral part of the Gospel*, affecting that appeal to the human conscience which is the preaching of the Gospel.' That is an extraordinary statement and we have italicized it accordingly, but it is also illuminating and explains a good deal that other people find offensive in Anglo-Catholicism. The other statement is almost as extraordinary. On p. 113 the Canon writes: 'Anglo-Catholics therefore have matter for grave concern. They cannot, as we have seen, accept any doctrinal definition of the Church of England alone as an ultimate standard of orthodoxy; they must relate it to the controlling authority of the Catholic Church as a whole.' That sentence certainly deserves to be italicized. It is a very cool claim to independence of the authority of the Church of which Anglo-Catholics are supposed to be loyal sons. Further on, in dealing with Transubstantiation, Canon Lacey says there are many doctrines of Transubstantiation, and he conveniently holds that the condemnation of this doctrine in the Thirty-nine Articles affects only one type! It will be seen why we regard the atmosphere of this book as somewhat stuffy. But all the same it is a competent and interesting exposition of Anglo-Catholic belief, not so attractive as 'Essays Catholic and Critical' but candid and exhaustive. If the other volumes of this series are as able and enlightening, Dr. Jacks may be congratulated on an enterprise of distinct usefulness.

LORD SHAFTESBURY.

'The name of Lord Shaftesbury will descend to posterity as the one who has, in his generation, worked more than any other individual to elevate the condition, and to raise the character of his countrymen.' This is the striking testimony of Lord Beaconsfield, no sentimentalist. 'Among men I do not know whom I should place second, but I would certainly put Lord Shaftesbury first. A man so firm in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, so intensely active in the cause of God and man, I have never known.' This is the testimony of Charles Spurgeon, a man of a very different type. It scarcely need be said that the character, the career, and the religious creed of a man who is known as the great emancipator should be familiar to every generation of his countrymen.

It is to good purpose therefore that in *Lord Shaftesbury and Social-Industrial Progress*, by the Rev. J. Wesley Bready, M.A., B.D., we should have a most graphic, sympathetic, and inspiring narrative of this outstanding reformer and apostle of a living Christianity (Allen & Unwin; 16s. net). Here we have the story of a child, neglected by his mother, tyrannized over by his father, but loved by his nurse Maria Millis. It was Maria Millis who took the eager child upon her knee and read to him long passages from the Bible, till Scripture characters became to him a living heritage. She was the future reformer's spiritual mother. This was the man whose Christian creed became 'On with Christ for the establishment of God's Kingdom, in righteousness on earth—"to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God."'

Mr. Wesley Bready does not follow the ordinary course of a biography. Thus, in an early chapter we have an arresting study of Lord Shaftesbury's religious creed, that of an Evangelical Churchman, ready, however, to welcome the company and support of all who shared his ideals, aspirations, and desire to see the will of God done upon earth, to rescue the perishing and to uplift the down-trodden. In almost every great reform for which he laboured—and these included the Ten Hours Factory Act, the women and children in mines and collieries, reform of asylums, the liquor traffic, Ragged Schools, popular education, shorter working hours, Saturday half-holiday, the provision of public parks and recreation, and many more—he was a generation and even two generations in front of public opinion. But nothing daunted this perfervid disciple of Him who came to seek and to save the lost. He was regarded as an extremist, a

dreamer of dreams. But what a change in many directions if only his dreams had been realized during his lifetime.

Professor A. N. Whitehead, F.R.S., Sc.D., has given to the second series of his Lowell Lectures the title of *Religion in the Making* (Cambridge University Press; 6s. net). It is somewhat difficult to see why this particular title should have been chosen, for the lectures contain much metaphysics but little religion as commonly understood. The four lectures deal respectively with Religion in History, Religion and Dogma, Body and Spirit, Truth and Criticism. This is appetizing, but the expectant reader presently finds himself led along lines of sustained abstract thinking to high regions where undoubtedly mountains do emerge for a moment through the mist, but very little in the form of landscape is visible. Perhaps this is due to extreme compression of thought, for a system of metaphysics cannot be adequately set forth in four lectures. One is reminded of the mathematical teacher at whose hands most students have suffered, who solves his problem in a few swift and gigantic strides and leaves his class in a state of some dismay.

Much foolish controversy might have been avoided if the history of the New Testament Canon had been more generally known. In *The Formation of the New Testament* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. 6d. net) Professor Edgar J. Goodspeed of Chicago, already well known for his translation and other work on the New Testament, has told the story. In simple and attractive style the author shows how the different books of the New Testament came into existence; how, among these, different groups were gradually formed; and how at last, as the result of a process of selection, the books that form our New Testament were recognized as a unity. The varying fortunes of the documents and of the New Testament as a whole are traced through their different historical stages down to our own day. The publication of the Acts of the Apostles is credited with winning for Paul a recognition of his unique place in the Church, thus ensuring that his letters would be collected and preserved. It is claimed that, as early as 125, the fourfold Gospel was published, probably at Ephesus. The Catholic or non-sectarian Church was founded about 180, and its greatest accomplishment was the creation of the New Testament. The attitude of the Reformers to the New Testament Canon, as illustrated here and elsewhere, should be much better known than it is. Dr. Goodspeed wisely includes an account of the New Testament Apocrypha, and concludes a volume which ought to be widely read with an illuminating account of the position of the New Testament to-day.

Here is what a friendly introducer says in a 'Foreword' about *Life and Man*, by Mr. T. A. Bowhay (Cape; 9s. net). It is premised that the MS. of the book was circulated widely before publication. 'Some are so irritated to the core of their being that they declare if they read any more they will go mad. Some are roused to bitter, intellectual opposition. Some can see no sense until they have read repeatedly, compelled to do so by a curious inner necessity. . . . Some will read a few paragraphs only, and instantly feel awed by the revelation they offer of the meaning of life. They say: this is what I have been waiting for; this writer *knows*, does not merely believe or think.' And then the same kind friend adds for himself: 'It will be easy partially to digest this book, and see, feel nothing original in it; impossible to study it and not know one is in contact with the most revolutionary thought of our time.' A reviewer is naturally dazed by such a battery of laudation; and when he finds himself unable to rise to the height of it he naturally introspects to see in what class he may be found. Not among those in danger of madness, we hope. Nor among those staggered by the greatness and sublimity of this achievement. Let us rather say that here we have an independent earnest Christian mind meditating in its own way on the great matters. He is original because he thinks for himself. He is paradoxical because he is built that way. He asserts that Christianity is not a religion. He is not unorthodox, but he looks at truth and life from an angle different from yours. It is a book that will help people to think, and that is real praise.

Four volumes of a new series of a—what shall we call it?—commentary or introduction or study of the books of the Bible have just come to hand. The series bears the general title *The Study Bible* (Cassell; 3s. 6d. net each volume). The plan in each case is this. To begin with there is an appreciation of the Scripture book religiously. Then follow the passages from the book itself, with extracts from the great classical religious writers bearing on each. And, finally, there is an essay on the book considered critically. Take the *Psalms*

as an example. The religious appreciation is written by the Rev. L. MacLean Watt, D.D., on 'Their Secret and their Appeal,' the critical essay is written by the Rev. Professor J. E. McFadyen, D.D. The latter is an extraordinarily fine piece of work. No one who knows Dr. McFadyen's learning, his power of interesting his readers, his command of the resources of Old Testament study, will be surprised to learn that this essay on the Psalter is entirely adequate. It gives just what a reader needs to know, and gives it in a way that every reader will find interesting. The other volumes and their writers are as follow: *Genesis*, by Principal E. Griffith-Jones, D.D., and Professor A. C. Welch, D.D.; *Hebrews*, by Dean Inge and Professor H. L. Goudge, M.A., D.D., of Oxford; and *St. Luke*, by the Rev. Dr. Norwood, of the City Temple, and Professor F. R. Barry, D.S.O., M.A., of King's College. All the volumes are on their own lines excellent.

Many among us will welcome the appearance of a second series of *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion*, by that singularly gifted Roman Catholic layman, the late Baron Friedrich von Hügel, LL.D., D.D. (Dent; 15s. net). A modernist in outlook, von Hügel has exercised a deep influence upon theologically and philosophically minded men and women of this generation, irrespective of creed or school. This has been due, apart from his learning and reflective ability, and despite his curiously overloaded style, to the breadth of his intellectual sympathies, the tender human quality that breaks through his writings, and, above all, the true note of religious experience that he sounds so insistently, so earnestly and joyously.

The volume before us consists of ten essays and addresses, written between 1904 and 1922. They differ in importance, as also in scope and adventure. There is an eloquent plea for official authority as a normally necessary part of the total religious life; a learned study of the place and function of the historical element in religion; and a cognate study, with George Fox illustrating the radically opposite view, of the bodily, that is, the historical and the institutional in religion. 'Universalism and Ecclesiasticism, Spiritualism and Sacramentalism,' says von Hügel, 'can go, indeed have gone and do go together, each in and through the other.' A peculiarly interesting essay, rich in concrete instance, is on certain central needs of religion, and the difficulties of liberal movements in face of the needs; another essay is in substance a criticism, able and penetrating, in the name of the Platonist tradition of God as the Self-existent, of the pantheistic flavour of the late Dr. Pringle-Pattison's Gifford Lectures. But the most valuable, as it is also the most elaborate, of all the essays is that on 'Suffering and God.' It examines the Greek, the Jewish, and the Patripassian currents of thought about God, and holds with St. Bernard, in his classic lament on the death of his twin-brother Gerard, that there exists the deepest *compassio*, but no *passio*—only Pure Joy—in God. It is an essay that will be provocative of much discussion. In the background of it lie the Platonist tradition aforesaid and the orthodox dogma of the Two Natures in Christ.

The Indian Outlook, by Mr. W. E. S. Holland (Edinburgh House Press; 2s. 6d. net), is in the highest degree an informing and thought-provoking book. Any one who wishes to get a sane and well-balanced view of the currents of opinion among the educated classes in India, in relation both to the Empire and to the Christian faith, and the causes which have led to the formation of that opinion, cannot do better than read it. And every reader will find in it abundant food for serious reflection and searching of heart. Perhaps the picture of Indian unrest is somewhat highly coloured, for, as the writer himself remarks, 'Probably the masses in India do not greatly care who rules them, if only they are fed and prosperous.' Still the present attitude of the educated classes is of immense significance, and cannot be too closely and sympathetically studied.

In regard to India's attitude to Christianity, two hopeful facts emerge. On the one hand, 'the village population is still as open as ever to receive the Christian message. The outcaste peoples are still crowding into the Church, which stretches out to them the hand of human brotherhood.' On the other hand, among the intelligentsia 'there is an increasing appreciation of the fact that Christianity is in origin an Eastern religion. While there is a growing revulsion against European Christianity, educated India is each day more and more powerfully attracted by the figure of the Christ. His irresistible spell is already upon India. It is a most rare thing to-day for the missionary working amongst the educated classes to come across any opposition to the person or claims of Jesus Christ. His way is open as never before to the heart of thinking India.'

The incomparable A. B. Davidson had a famous

lecture on Saul, to hear which his students returned year after year, leaving other distinguished professors with empty class-rooms. It never ceased to thrill, and the spell of it remained in after years. Dr. R. S. Simpson told how, on one occasion, in writing a sermon on Saul he had a positive struggle to follow his own line of thought, and how thankful he was that he had done so when from the pulpit he saw his old professor among the audience. The Rev. J. A. Hutton, D.D., is strong enough to follow his own line on any topic he may handle, and his treatment of the first king of Israel in *The Tragedy of Saul* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 6s. net) is a masterly character study, marked by all that freshness of thought, that insight and imagination and poetic feeling which we have learned to associate with everything that comes from his pen.

In *Studies in the Text of the New Testament* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 8s. 6d. net), Professor A. T. Robertson, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., of Louisville, Kentucky, continues the work, for which he is already so well known, of popularizing the results of New Testament scholarship. This book provides 'illuminating sidelights on the text and teachers of the New Testament.' As in a former volume he pleaded that the preacher should be able to read the Greek New Testament, in this volume his plea is that the preacher should know something of textual criticism. The story of the Textus Receptus is told afresh, the losses and gains in the critical text are estimated, there is a brief account of Canon Streeter's theory of local texts, and an account of readings in the Western text that seem to be right. There was room for the chapter on 'The Revision after Forty Years,' and the discussion of Recent Translations may give guidance to any who are hesitating in their choice of one of the modern translations.

The last sermon in 'The Christian Year' this month has been taken from the Rev. T. H. Darlow's latest volume. The title of the volume is *The Love of God* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 6s. net). It contains twenty-five addresses, the idea of love binding them all together. There is much thought that will be found suggestive here, and it is presented in the attractive way that we expect from the former Literary Secretary of the Bible Society, and from the author of the outstanding biography of Robertson Nicoll.

Notable Women of the Bible, by Annie R. Marble (Sampson Low ; 3s. 6d. net), contains a brief record of every woman of any importance mentioned in the Bible, including the Apocrypha. The field is immense, and the number of characters introduced is very great, but they are skilfully grouped under the headings of Wives, Mothers, Women in Patriotic and Religious Service, Friends and Co-workers. The writer shows accurate knowledge of Bible history and of the social conditions of Bible lands. She succeeds in painting a very complete and vivid picture of the Hebrew woman in her home. Many of the sketches are illuminated by references to modern literature and art, and a very full index adds to the utility of the book.

Books on religious teaching are not always very helpful, but we may make an exception of *Winning Ways in Teaching*, by Mr. T. Oliver (Melrose ; 3s. 6d. net). In spite of its unattractive title, it is full of common sense, based on a real experience of teaching. All teachers will confirm the hints given here, to the beginner for the most part. And where one differs there is room for two opinions. The points dealt with are too numerous for mention. But it may be said that any student of teaching, whether in the day school or Sunday school, will find real guidance in this book, for both the preparation of his lesson, and (what is more important) the preparation of himself for giving a lesson.

Notes on St. John and the Apocalypse, by Mr. Alexander Pallis (Milford ; 3s.), belongs to a type of literature of which we have too little. It is not an exhaustive commentary on these two New Testament books, but only contains notes on points on which the author has something new or important to say. At the beginning of Jn 6^{32} the suggestion is made that for *ou* we should read *ei*. 'Though you did once receive bread from above (the manna), still the true bread is that given by my Father.' 5^{47} he believes to be an example of a misplaced negative : 'If you believe his writings, how is it that you do not believe my words?' On 18^{1} the suggestion is offered that we should read not 'another' but 'a new' disciple, this unnamed disciple being John Mark, who was for a time under a cloud. The point of 19^{34}, 'immediately blood and water issued,' is that the body had not dried up or suffered corruption in any way, thus providing a fulfilment of Ps 16^{10}. The incorruptibility of Christ's body became a frequent argument in early Christianity. The volume is one of much interest.

There cannot be many subjects on which people

speak with more assurance and less knowledge than on Buddhism. And, until quite recently, the lack of knowledge at least was not inexcusable. For the great mass of the teachings of the Buddha had not been made accessible to us in the West. Really to know with some smattering of first-hand knowledge, one had to learn Pali—an ungainly, sprawling kind of tongue with small winsomeness about it. That was a fairly dense and prickly thicket to have to push through. And yet only so, in the words of the old story of Huien Tsiang, could one reach the out-of-the-way cave upon the walls of which appeared the authentic vision of the great teacher. All that is now rapidly passing away, thanks to the energy and enthusiasm of a band of very thorough scholars who are translating the long Pali Scriptures for us bit by bit. Here, for example, comes the second and concluding volume of Majjhima Nikāya, that central work, *Further Dialogues of the Buddha*, by Lord Chalmers, G.C.B. (Milford; 12s. 6d. net). This is a plain path, beaten broad and even, which the most stumbling feet can follow, and which leads one far into the heart of what has so greatly moved and helped so many of our fellows down the ages. Those who know a little more will be grateful to Mrs. Rhys Davids for an index that is much more than an index.

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have published a little volume entitled *The Prophet Daniel, and Other Essays*, by Constance L. Maynard, First Principal of Westfield College (2s. net). It is a series of brief devotional studies that centre chiefly round the Book of Daniel; some are suggested by a verse or two in the Song of Songs, and the concluding themes are Divine Pardon and Prayer. There is no attempt made to consider the 'Visions' of the Book of Daniel in detail, and the writer's attitude to the Song is suggested by her decision to 'choose out one of the few sentences that are obviously intelligible.' Within these limits the volume should be a useful help to the devotional life, particularly perhaps the brief chapters on Divine Pardon. He 11[1] is thus happily paraphrased, 'Now faith is the conviction that the Ideal exists, even though you cannot see a trace of it.'

The Adult School Lesson Handbook for 1927 has just reached us, and we gladly commend it to leaders of classes and brotherhoods. The title is *The Life We Live* (National Adult School Union; 1s. 6d. net). The scheme of study is to look at life all round and see what it is like in the Christian view. The lessons are carefully prepared and adequately illustrated. In short, this volume is as good as its predecessors.

The problem of securing an adequate number of suitable candidates for the ministry appears to be as urgent in America as in this country. Professor Henry Schaeffer, Ph.D., S.T.M., laments in his recent book, *The Call to Prophetic Service* (Revell; $3.25), that 'an alarmingly small percentage of the brightest boys in college ever find their way into the ministry' (p. 125), and that even of those who do 'only about fifty per cent of the ministerial candidates'—at any rate in one Church College which he does not name—'have the consent of both parents' (p. 38). With a view to remedying this defect, so far as it can be remedied by an appeal in written form, Dr. Schaeffer has written his book with the above title. In it he deals with the calls of Abraham, Moses, Samuel, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Jonah, John the Baptist, Jesus, The Twelve, and Paul. The chapters are very far from being mere rhetorical appeals: they are a careful study of the whole historical situation—so much so, indeed, that one could derive from the successive chapters a very good idea of the sequence of Hebrew history. The book is an appeal, alike stirring and informing, to the young men of to-day to enter the goodly succession of those who have served their generation in the prophetic office. Such appeals should be more frequent, and ministers might well learn from Dr. Schaeffer how to deliver them effectively.

In the latest volume of the publishers' series of 'English Theologians,' Dr. W. J. Sparrow Simpson gives an interesting, and at the same time scholarly and fair-minded, account of the life and writings of *Archbishop Bramhall* (S.P.C.K.; 8s. 6d. net), the energetic and devoted Churchman whose merit was early recognized by Laud, and on whom Wentworth laid the unenviable task of reforming the Irish Church and recovering its lost possessions. It is a tribute to Bramhall's ability and influence that he was known to his contemporaries, whether friends or foes, even by such designations as the Irish Canterbury, Athanasius Hibernicus, and—playing upon his name—the Bramble (that the trees called to rule over them).

In accordance with the object of the series, the most space is given to Bramhall as a writer. His style may often be pedantic, as when he complains to one of his opponents: 'You congregate heterogeneous matter, and segregate that which is homogeneous.' But there is no doubt as to his ability

in controversy, whether with Presbyterians or Romanists, with Thomas Hobbes or Richard Baxter. As a contemporary Irish Bishop said, 'He sat on the highest seat of polemic theology.'

Dr. Sparrow Simpson is led to speculate what so acute and able a divine as Bramhall might have produced in the form of constructive theology had his lot been happier and more peaceful. Be that as it may, he is well justified in holding, from his own standpoint, that Bramhall's writings remain 'chief illustrations of an ecclesiastical type which aspired to be Catholic without being Roman, and to adhere to what was primitive without papal additions on the one side, or Puritan diminutions on the other.'

Proofs are multiplying that there is a growing popular demand for books dealing in a serious way with the ultimate problems of life. To the elaborate treatment offered by Canon Streeter in 'Reality,' to which we called attention last month, falls now to be added a very competent book on a much smaller scale by Dr. T. G. Dunning. It is entitled *God and the Absolute*, with the sub-title, 'The Philosophical Significance of Religious Experience' (S.C.M.; 3s. net), and its worth is warmly attested in a prefatory note by Professor C. C. J. Webb. The book is a powerful claim for the unique nature of religious experience. While it is true that the science of religion is only one among many, one of the several approaches to reality, it is a quite distinctive approach. Religion cannot be interpreted in terms of something else, not even of morality, and yet it should and can fill everything else. One might, in a sense, reach the philosopher's Absolute without quite finding the saint's God. 'The Absolute is the goal of a purely intellectual search,' while 'God is the object of a personal quest.' In the relationship between the saints and God there is a personal warmth that is absent from the relationship between the philosopher as such and the Absolute. The discussion opens out into questions of personality and immortality and other such high themes, in all of which the reader feels himself to be in contact with an earnest, lucid, and powerful mind, equally at home in philosophy and theology.

Prayer: Some Facts and Fallacies, by the Rev. F. H. Brabant (S.C.M.; 2s. net), is a little book full of sound sense. It discusses briefly but with freshness some of the difficulties and misunderstandings which arise in connexion with the subject of prayer, and gives some practical hints for the ordering of the devotional life. The treatment of prayer in connexion with the new psychology is particularly good, and should do something to lay one of the chief spectres of the modern mind.

The *Selected Addresses and Papers of Simon Wolf* (Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Cincinnati) will appeal more particularly to Jewish readers. The volume is designed to perpetuate the memory of Wolf, who came from Germany in 1848 at the age of twelve to the United States, and who during the sixty years or so that preceded his death in 1923 took an active and influential part in public affairs. Many of his speeches or lectures delivered on important occasions are here reproduced, on such subjects as 'The Influence of the Jews on the Progress of the World,' 'Church and State,' 'The Bible in the Public Schools,' etc. He was a man of generous outlook who, devoted Jew as he was, believed that 'there is practically very little difference in the various faiths among intelligent people.' He was a powerful champion of the absolute separation of Church and State, and his attitude to the teaching of the Bible in the public schools is expressed in the following sentence: 'If the parent is desirous of having the child taught along certain religious lines, there are ample opportunities of doing this outside of the public schools, without calling upon the public machinery for carrying it into effect.'

We have not yet come to terms in the fullest sense with evolution as it bears on religion. But candid minds will be helped in this effort by a book just published, *Evolution in Religion*, by Mr. William Stuart, B.A. (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net). The author not only traces the evolutionary development of religion historically, but classifies religions according to their origin and characteristics, and traces the same process through the individual life. The general thesis of the argument may be said to be this: that the Spirit of God is in and behind *all* religion, and that therefore all religions may be regarded as in a sense and in part revelations from God. But this process came to its climax in Christianity which is the fulfilment of what other religions merely hinted at. Other religions are evidence of the presence of God in man awakening a thirst for God Himself. Christianity satisfies this thirst. It might seem that such a view leaves no room for an absolute religion. But the writer refuses to admit this, and rightly finds the proof of the absoluteness of the Christian religion in the Person of Christ. This is a book that will both enlighten and reassure readers. It is a task

done by a very capable mind, and done with scholarship and independent thought.

The Rev. George S. Marr, M.A., B.D., D.Litt., M.B., Ch.B., of Lady Yester's Parish Church, Edinburgh, has published a volume of addresses to boys and girls. The title is *Happy Youth* (Allenson ; 3s. 6d. net). They are admirable talks, simple in language ; but not too simple. We are specially impressed by the range of the talks and the amount of accurate information Dr. Marr possesses on all this variety of subjects, and which he is able to use so skilfully to keep the interest of the boys and girls.

The object of the 'People's Library' (Hodder & Stoughton ; 2s. 6d. net) is not only to have learning without tears, but to make the acquisition of knowledge a thrilling and entertaining adventure. This object has been attained in the volume *Queen Elizabeth*. The author is Mr. Sidney Dark, who is also the chief editor of the whole series. His Elizabeth is 'not the Virgin Queen who has become a Protestant tradition, nor the Gloriana invented, with their tongues in their cheeks, by her cavalier courtiers, and accepted without qualification by such writers as Charles Kingsley, nor even the heroic figure which Mr. Frederick Chamberlin has created with so much learning and enthusiasm, but none the less the Elizabeth of history—the coarse-minded, coarse-tongued Tudor, who lied and swore like a trooper, and by the sheer force of unscrupulous genius made her country a great power.'

The Minutes of the One Hundred and Eighty-third Annual Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, held last year in the Cathedral city of York, form the Year Book of the denomination (Epworth Press). It is a volume of more than six hundred pages, and contains the latest official details as to the membership and the organization and the activities of this great religious body. Any one who adds to it *The Methodist Year Book, 1927*, issued by the same denomination in the United States, will have at command much up-to-date information as to the people called Methodists on both sides of the Atlantic.

From the Baptist Union Publication Department in London we have *The Baptist Handbook for 1927* (5s. net), containing similar full details as to the Baptist Union in the United Kingdom.

The Scottish Church and University Almanac, 1927 (Macniven & Wallace ; 2s. 6d. net), contains the usual detailed information under the headings of Synods and Presbyteries of the ministers of the Church of Scotland, the United Free Church, the Free Church, the Presbyterian Church of England, the Episcopal, the Roman Catholic, and Congregational, Baptist, and Wesleyan Churches in Scotland. This is followed by the necessary information as to all the Scottish Universities. The accuracy of the contents will stand the test of the examination of its particulars.

The Parables of the Treasure and the Pearl.

By Professor W. P. Paterson, D.D., Edinburgh.

Some of the parables, notably the Prodigal Son and the Good Samaritan, have been equally prized in every period and in every branch of the Christian Church. Others have had their vicissitudes of favour and neglect, according as they were deemed more or less profitable for doctrine and for instruction in righteousness. Roman Catholic theology has searched them for testimony to its doctrine of Church and Sacraments, and Protestantism has magnified those which fall in with the gospel of a free and full forgiveness. The pulpit has had its preferences which reflected changes in the spiritual temperature or in the proportion of faith. When it was chiefly sought to persuade men by the terror of the Lord, the preacher was drawn to those which are charged with the menaces of death, judgment, and eternity—as the Ten Virgins, Dives and Lazarus, the Talents and the Pounds. In these latter days, when eschatology has become almost as much of a problem as a message, there has been a predilection for the group represented by the Sower and the Leaven, which point to a gradual coming of the Kingdom, and throw light on the laws of its development and the hindrances to its progress. If much use is still made of the Parable of the Talents, it is not because of its climax of

final doom and the horrors of the outer darkness, but because of the importance for the present life of the principle that faculty increases through service, and is weakened or extirpated by disuse.

The Parables of the Hid Treasure and the Pearl were highly esteemed in the golden ages which had received a manifest baptism with the Holy Ghost and with fire, and in which, along with the faith that removes mountains, the ventures and the sacrifices of the Christian life were on the heroic plane. In the silver and leaden ages there has naturally been a disposition to ignore them or to tone them down. Their special interest for us lies in the fact that they have some features which connect them with modern modes of thought, while in respect of their central lesson and its high-pitched demand they are a grave challenge to latter-day Christianity. We shall first touch on the modern elements and thereafter examine the challenge.

I.

The Modern Features.

During the last two centuries an immense amount of work has been done in what may be called the study of religion from the outside. While medicine has been left to the doctors, and jurisprudence on the whole to the lawyers, it has been thought desirable to throw religion open to general discussion. The theologian, it was felt, is a man under authority who defends foregone conclusions; and it was considered expedient that the important subject should be investigated by those who, occupying the disinterested standpoint of Science or Philosophy, could be relied on to take broad views and to give impartial judgments. The result is that theological literature has been enriched by Histories of Religion, Philosophies of Religion, a Science of Religion, and a Psychology of Religion. And it is an illustration of the truth that wisdom is revealed to babes—or that simplicity can be deep—that some of the conclusions which have been laboriously reached in these imposing discipline had already been found on the surface of the modest stories about the treasure trove and the wonderful jewel.

1. *The Function of Religion.*—One of the great standing topics in the philosophical treatment of the subject has been the question as to the function of religion. What is the end that man has sought in cultivating communion with a Divine Being or Beings? One theory is that religion is an affair of the intellect; and that its use has been to enable man to understand, or to suppose that he understands, the kind of world in which he finds himself alive, the nature of the Supreme Power that is manifest therein, and his own place and destiny within the scheme of things. A second view is that it is an affair of the feelings—being akin to the emotions excited by the beautiful and sublime in Nature and in works of art—and that its service is to hallow experience with unique sentiments of awe, reverence, and love, and to shed abroad in the heart a heavenly peace and joy. A third is that religion has had as strictly practical a purpose as, say, agriculture or medicine. At the same time it would appear that these three theories are at one in holding that religion is concerned with things which are appreciated by the human mind as having worth for human beings. The business of religion, in the current phrase, is with values. The dispute is as to the kinds which have been chiefly sought in religion—whether the intellectual values that minister to the inquiring mind, or the affective values that delight the soul, or the substantial kinds which, as the economic and social values, satisfy the desire of outward well-being, or which, as the moral values, satisfy the aspiration after inward perfection. It is now generally held that the primary aim of religion has been to be useful as the means of protection against the dreaded evils of the human lot, and of the possession of vital well-being. And this last view seems to be right; for every religion which has made a mark on the life of nations has been trusted for an effective salvation of some sort which might indeed be nothing more than worldly prosperity and security, but which also could rise to the height of redemption, sanctification, and eternal life in God.

The twin Parables, now, might have been composed for a generation which discourses of religion in terms of values and of value-judgments. Jesus spoke much of the blessings of the Kingdom, and these Parables affirm and illustrate their value. They liken the Kingdom to gold and silver and precious stones—the things which every one thinks of as valuable, and which are indeed the very symbols of value. They go further and teach that the Kingdom so far surpasses the other kinds of value that it should be as natural and easy to give up everything else for its sake as it is for a man of affairs to make a profitable investment. They support the view that religion is not merely interesting and pleasant, but that above all it has practical utility. It may be added that they also throw light on the precise nature of the service which religion renders in the matter of values.

In his *Philosophy of Religion*, Professor Höffding limits its function to the conservation of values, and would thus need a parable in which attention was fixed on the savings which a man had gathered as the result of his labour and thrift, with the steps which he took in his anxiety about the safety of his hard-won gains. Our Parables relate the story of two persons who had a stroke of good fortune, and they thus support the view which is maintained against Höffding by Professor Sorley in his *Moral Values and the Idea of God*—to wit, that religion stands sponsor not merely for the conservation of values, but for a large increase of values.

2. *Types of Conversion.*—The sister-Parables have also a point of contact with the Psychology of Religion. The commentators have often found in them examples of two contrasted forms of religious experience. 'In the Parable of the Pearl,' says Olshausen, 'we have the picture of a noble nature which has sought after truth under an inward compulsion, and which, when the revelation of God in Christ has shined upon it, has seen therein the sum of all good, and taken possession of it through self-renunciation. In the Parable of the Hidden Treasure we have the picture of a more passive and receptive nature to which the good comes unexpected and unsought, though this man also has the courage and the power to make it his own at all costs.' 'Some there are,' says Trench, 'who feel that there must be an absolute good for man, who are therefore seeking everywhere and inquiring for this good. Such are likened to the merchant that has distinctly set before himself the purpose of seeking goodly pearls, and making these his own. There are others who do not discover that there is an aim or purpose for man's life, or a truth for him at all, until the truth as it is in Jesus is revealed to them. Such are compared to the finder of the hidden treasure, who stumbled upon it unawares, neither expecting nor looking for it.'

It is of interest to compare what is thus found in our Parables with the types that have been noted in the scientific study of the subject of conversion. Starbuck, in his *Psychology of Religion*, distinguishes three forms of experience according to the different ways in which the will behaves in the process leading up to conversion. One type of experience, he found, was the purely volitional, in which a person was conscious of a resolute self-determination which had persisted from the beginning, and which was felt to govern the final decision. A second was the purely non-volitional, in which light and peace came in the form of a spontaneous awakening. A third was the semi-volitional which began and was carried on with conscious and earnest purpose, while this at the decisive point was replaced by the self-surrender that casts the burden upon God. The pure volitional type may perhaps be recognized in a saying which might be a parable in germ—'the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force' (Mt 11^{12}). The other two are exemplified in our Parables. The worker in the field who lit on the hidden treasure when it was not in all his thoughts is a perfect example of the conversion which takes the form of a spontaneous awakening. The pearl-merchant may stand for the semi-volitional type, since there was a first stage of deliberate purpose and persevering effort, while at the second the situation was governed by the great discovery which was not of his doing, although it afterwards called him to energetic action.

The idea that the Parables have anything to do with the varieties of religious experience is scornfully dismissed by Jülicher on the ground that one parable only teaches one lesson. In this case the details are incidental to the lesson about the value of the Kingdom, and have no didactic significance. If the worker in the field had not been a seeker, it was for the reason that nobody but a fool devotes his life to digging at large in the expectation of striking treasure-trove. On the other hand, a dealer in pearls was bound to be on the outlook for bargains. But while there is much to be said for the general principle of one parable one lesson, it is possible to push it to a pedantic extreme. It is very unlikely that Jesus felt Himself bound to adhere as rigorously as a scientific exegete to a theory of the limits of parabolic teaching. As the two Parables point the same moral, there must be some reason why there are two when one would have served the purpose. It may be said that the lesson was repeated in order to deepen the impression, or that Jesus deemed it useful to vary it in different localities—the story of the treasure-trove being better adapted to awaken the interest of peasant folk, while the story of the trader and the jewel might make a stronger appeal to the city dwellers. It seems, however, to be at least as good an explanation that Jesus gave His lesson in two forms which mirrored the experience of two different classes of disciples, so that the first would be more convincing to one class, the second to the other. There were those like Matthew—to whom the revelation and the call came when he was sitting at the receipt of custom—who could recognize themselves in the digger who found the treasure when he was not seeking it. There were others

who did not recognize themselves in the careless and unexpectant treasure-finder, but who could rejoice in the similitude of the merchant seeking goodly pearls—those who, like Peter and Andrew, and the sons of Zebedee, had once journeyed from Galilee to the lower Jordan that they might learn more from John the Baptist of the laws and the promises of God, and who there found the Christ.

(*To be continued.*)

Samaria in Ahab's Time: Harvard Excavations and their Results.

By the Reverend J. W. Jack, M.A., Glenfarg.

The ancient town of Samaria lies immediately west of the modern village of Sebastîye. From the seventh year of Omri (*c.* 880), the kings of Israel had their chief palace there. The recent account by the Harvard University archæologists (G. A. Reisner, C. S. Fisher, and D. G. Lyon) of excavations on the site of this ancient capital,[1] together with comments by René Dussaud [2] and others, throw considerable light on the Israelite civilization at this early period. If Ps 45 be taken as presenting a picture of royal life and society in the first years of the Israelite monarchy, probably, as some think, in the time of Ahab [3] (*c.* 875–853), the excavations do nothing at least to weaken such a view. They give us a picture of the grandeur of Samaria, especially in his day, with its strong walls, its palaces, its temples, its private houses built with hewn stone (Am 5^{11}), its perfect organization, its riches, and its power. Renan has said that Ahab 'equalled Solomon in mental grasp and surpassed him in military valour.' [4] He certainly seems to have developed Israelite civilization.

The Harvard account affords confirmation of the Biblical fact (1 K 16^{24}) that the site was not inhabited before the time of Omri (*c.* 887). Excavations have been pushed to the ancient rock surface beneath. This surface, at its highest area (the Omri scarp), bears the channels and cup-marks common all over Palestine, and this must have been the condition of it when Omri bought the hill. No ceramic or other traces of habitation previous to Omri's date can be found: the only vestiges of occupation beyond the iron age belong to the neolithic period.

Only one gate into the town is mentioned in the Old Testament, and this has been found on the west, with traces of primitive fortification consisting in a tower or citadel, measuring 57·41 feet by 42·65 feet, of solid well-built masonry, which dates from the time of Omri. The bottom of this tower has been unearthed, sunk in a deep trench (over 16 feet deep at one part) in the rock. It was on the esplanade or open space in front of this that the famous council of war took place between Ahab and Jehoshaphat, when they decided to attack Ramoth-Gilead. The ancient defensive wall of the town, dating, it is thought, from Omri's time, must have been of massive construction. It has been uncovered only in two places, at the western gate and at one point towards the south where it is found to be about 10 feet thick, with bosses on all the outer stones. The ground slopes down considerably on the outside of the wall here, and to prevent the front of the latter from slipping down the cliff it has been placed over 3 feet back from the verge, and its foundations have been sunk about 6 feet deep into the rocky bottom. In this way the building of a formidable supporting glacis, such as existed at Megiddo, was avoided.

Omri's palace, the foundations of which have been excavated to the solid rock cut to receive them, is not a large one, and the material used for its construction is a poor quality of yellow limestone obtained from the site and the adjacent slopes, where a number of small quarries have been uncovered. It is composed of various halls abutting on open courts. Many of the exterior stones have

[1] *Harvard Excavations at Samaria* (1908–10). Harvard University Press, 1924.

[2] 'Samarie au temps d'Achab,' *Revue Syria*, 1926, pp. 314 ff.

[3] Renan, *Hist. du peuple d'Israël*, ii. pp. 263 ff.; *Syria*, 1925, p. 318.

[4] *Op. cit.*, ii. p. 301.

a heavy rough boss with a marginal dressing on the edges, like the rusticated work of the Petti Palace in Florence. This architectural device is found more commonly under Ahab, and really belongs to Palestine. Immediately to the west of this building and connected with it, Ahab erected his 'ivory palace' (1 K 22^{39}; cf. Ps 45^{8}), making Omri's structure the nucleus of it. This second palace, the foundations of which were also laid in rock cuttings, is far more extensive in plan and better constructed, showing a taste for architecture which was doubtless fostered by Tyrian influence. The palace is composed of three parts: first, the palace properly so-called; then a vast outer court, 104 yards long, enclosed by a heavy retaining wall over 6 feet thick, around which was a series of small rooms, serving no doubt as domestic offices, chariot houses, and stables; and lastly, a strong rectangular tower (41 feet by 52·49 feet) outside this court and guarding the entrance. For this new construction beautiful blocks of yellow limestone were used, a fact which has led Reisner to conclude that herein lies the origin of the term 'ivory palace.' But this term was applied rather to houses the rooms of which were panelled or decorated with ivory (cf. Am 3^{15}), as many rooms still are in Damascus and other cities of the East. The Egyptian and Babylonian monuments refer to the widespread trade in ivory, and Ahab must have had no difficulty in securing sufficient quantities of this material from Tyre, which was the principal centre of the trade (Ezk $27^{6.15}$). An ivory box found at Enkomi in Cyprus, picturing a Syrian or Phœnician chariot, dates from this epoch.[1] In the courtyard of Ahab's palace the excavators discovered an ivory handle carved in the form of a winged Uræus, and an ivory dagger handle with the end shaped in the form of a snarling lion's head; and in early débris elsewhere they found fragments of ivory, including an object shaped like an Egyptian breast pendant, in the form of a Bes-head, with ornamental collar.

One of the most interesting parts of the building laid bare is the tower (אַרְמוֹן),[2] which stood in front of the entrance, and in which the royal guard generally lived so as to be near the palace without being inside it. It was in this very tower that king Pekahiah was assassinated by his chief officer, Pekah (2 K 15^{25}). In the days before Omri, when Tirzah was the capital of Israel, the royal palace there also possessed a protective tower or *armon* (1 K 16^{18}), and when Omri attacked the town, Zimri fled to this place of defence, set fire to it, and perished in the flames. Dussaud may be right in concluding that this fire was one of the reasons which, at a time when the Assyrian menace was becoming threatening, led Omri to found another capital, and it is not improbable that the *armon* at Samaria, ascribed by the excavators to Ahab, dates from Omri's reign, especially as it is only about ten yards from the latter's palace.

Within the great court of Ahab's palace, near the southern extremity of it, there are the remains of a fairly large building (82 feet by 36 feet), containing eighteen square rooms opening off corridors, which has apparently been the residence of the royal stewards, or at least magazines or storerooms for oil and wine brought to the palace as revenue, as the *ostraka* mentioning these products were found in it. This building, containing doubtless records and other valuable things also, was probably the place that Ben-Hadad II. was anxious to search in addition to Ahab's palace (1 K 20^{6}). At the north end of the court is a cemented pool or fish-pond (33·63 feet by 17 feet, but sometime later the size was lessened), about 20 inches deeper at the one end than the other, the bottom of which has a thick layer of greyish cement harder than the rock beneath. This pond must have served for watering the horses and for cleaning the chariots. We cannot help recalling the historic scene when Ahab, after being mortally wounded at the attack on Ramoth-Gilead, bled to death in his chariot, and his servants washed it along with his armour in the 'pool of Samaria' (1 K 22^{38}). After Ahab's death, other buildings with even better masonry, which are attributed tentatively by the excavators to Jeroboam II., including a great circular defensive tower (diameter about 33 feet inside) with walls over 7 feet thick, were added immediately beyond the court on the west side.

The excavations have unearthed a certain amount of Israelite pottery (*c.* 900–700) from the floor débris of the Ahab courtyard and the ground underneath. Most of this is ordinary wheel-made, though much of it is of a finer quality, and some of it is decorated with coloured bands or with incised pattern. Among other interesting objects discovered in the Israelite débris were open (or saucer) lamps with one or more spouts; large bowls of slate or black and white diorite; flints and stone implements evidently in use in the Israelite period long after the introduction of metal; small whorl-shaped objects with a narrow hole, supposed

[1] Dussaud, *Civilizations pré-helléniques*, 2e éd., fig. 199.

[2] 2 K 15^{25}; cf. Tirzah, 1 K 16^{18}.

by Macalister to be buttons; slabs and splinters of blue glass (raw material); iron arrow-heads (the only metal objects found in undisturbed Israelite ground); flat bone spatulæ or styli, rounded at one end and sharpened at the other, and supposed to be either for writing on wax or clay (as Macalister thinks), or for use in one of the common household industries (as Reisner suggests); Egyptian amulets and scarabs (including an Egyptian gold scarab ring, and an Assyrian clay letter-seal with the name of the addressee in cuneiform); club-shaped pendants of bone ornamented with dotted circles; crude figurines of females with tight-fitting robes; and numerous other things. Many of these objects were not confined, of course, to the Israelite débris, but were also found in some or all of the other periods. No pieces of Israelite sculpture of any sort were discovered.

The chief interest, however, of the excavations lies in the *ostraka* or potsherds, of which sixty-one are legible and contain Hebrew writing. These have been discovered in the 'storehouse' referred to, in the lowest part of the débris. The writing, which is beautifully traced with ordinary carbon ink by means of a reed pen,[1] and with wonderful regularity, not only gives us geographic and economic details, but reveals the nature of the ancient Israelitic alphabet in the time of Ahab, much earlier than the Zendjirli, the Baal-Lebanon, or the Moabite inscriptions. The *ostraka* were not intended to be permanent records, but were mere temporary notes, consisting of small accounts of oil and wine for the palace. For particularly important writings papyrus was the material employed, and judging from the 500 rolls of this which Wenamon took from Egypt to Byblos two centuries before Ahab, there must have been a considerable amount of it used. But for ordinary purposes, especially where economy was an element, *ostraka* (חַרְשִׂית) seem to have been the material, and not only Samaria but also Elephantine has furnished us with numerous specimens. They were usually broken to a suitable shape with a certain amount of skill, and the inscriptions were not written horizontally as jar labels were (always on the upper part of the jar), but at various angles, and the scribe was sometimes forced to split a word at the end of a line, so as to fit the potsherd. The excavators have had little difficulty in dating the Samaria ones. The words are separated by strokes or points, a distinction recognized as very ancient.

[1] On the process adopted, cf. Breasted, *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, xxxii. (1916), 230 ff.

The whole circumstances show that they date from the reign of Ahab, and this has been confirmed by the discovery in the same débris of fragments of a jar of Egyptian alabaster containing the name of Osorkon II. of Egypt (*c.* 874–856), a contemporary of Ahab. They are dated the ninth, tenth, eleventh, and thirteenth year (though no king's name is mentioned), and if the average of these dates be taken we may therefore fix them about the eleventh year, *i.e.* about 864, being at least twenty years earlier than the inscription of Moab (*c.* 842). We have already an Israelite seal dating from this period.[2] It is an intaglio found at Megiddo and bearing the epigraph: 'To Shema', servant of Jeroboam.'

The form of alphabet used is like that of the oldest known Israelite inscriptions, and an examination of it leads to several important conclusions. For one thing, the approximate date of the small agricultural plaque from Gezer, which Lidzbarski, Gray, and Ronzevalle have placed in the eighth century, if not in the ninth,[3] must now be fixed earlier, probably about 900.[4] If the characters on it be compared with the Phœnician ones at Byblos in the tenth century[5] and with those on the Samaria *ostraka*, they will be found to be intermediate between these two. The letters *ḥeth* ( ), *lamed* ( ), *mem* ( ), and *ṣade* ( ) are similar to the Phœnician, but not so developed as the Samaria specimens of these. On the other hand, *yodh* ( ) and *caph* ( ) are identical with the Samaria characters, and they thus show progress beyond the Phœnician. It is therefore apparent that the Gezer plaque must be assigned to about 900 B.C., rather than later, as generally supposed, and this is also evident from its use of *vav* in place of the definite article (a matter to which we refer below). Seeing that some characters on the plaque exhibit slight changes from the Phœnician, it must have been at this time that the Hebrew writing showed a tendency to deviate from the latter, as it was probably at this time also—or a little before it, certainly not later—that the Greeks borrowed their alphabet from Phœnicia.[6] Thanks to our epigraphists we have now specimens of at least seven stages or 'landmarks' in the evolution of the ancient northern Semitic alphabet. It is now

[2] Schumacher, *Tell el-Mutesellim*, i. p. 99.

[3] *P.E.F. Quarterly Statement*, 1909, pp. 26, 32, 112.

[4] Cf. Dussaud, *Syria*, 1926, pp. 327 f.

[5] For these (the Inscription of Abibaal, and that of Elibaal on bush of Osorkon I.) see Montet, *Revue Biblique*, July 1926, pp. 321 ff.

[6] Cf. *Syria*, 1924, p. 157, and 1925, p. 103.

generally agreed[1] that we must start, not from the Babylonian cuneiform writing or the Sumerian picture writing, nor from the Cyprian, Minoan, or Phæstos scripts, but from the Egyptian hieroglyphics.[2] This being so, we have (1) the Serâbît el-Khâdim inscriptions, in primitive Semitic characters, discovered by Petrie in the Sinaitic Peninsula, which were invented probably by the Hyksos (as Sethe has lately shown), and date from about 1900 B.C.; (2) the Phœnician, which we find several centuries later in Ahiram's tomb at Byblos about 1250,[3] and which has apparently developed from the former, as the southern Semitic has also probably done; (3) the inscriptions of Abibaal (*c.* 947) and of Elibaal (*c.* 925), both found at Byblos and exhibiting excellent specimens of the Phœnician alphabet; (4) the Gezer specimen, dating from about 900; (5) the Samaria *ostraka* (*c.* 864); (6) the inscription of Mesha on the Moabite stone (*c.* 842); and (7) the Siloam inscription, engraved in a recess of the Ophel tunnel (*c.* 700). After this late date we have numerous Israelite seals in hard stone, containing alphabetical characters.[4]

Another point worth noting, to which Dussaud and others have drawn attention, is the difference between the definite article in the Gezer plaque[5] and the Samaria *ostraka*. In the former *vav* is employed, as ירחו אסף ('month of the fruit-harvest'), ירחו לקש ('month of the after-grass'), etc., while in the latter we have *he*, as בשת התשעת ('in the ninth year'), הין ('the wine,' for הַיַּיִן), etc. The *vav* seems to show that the Hebrew language at the beginning of the ninth century was at least hesitating as to the notation to be adopted for the article (there was none in Phœnician writing), whereas about a quarter of a century later, judging from the *ostraka*, the choice had become definitely fixed on *he*. We know that originally *vav* was not a mere copulative conjunction but had binding force and was sometimes applied in this sense to denote juxtaposition or connexion.[6] This use of it, as Professor G. Hoffmann has pointed out, made the second noun definite, so that the *vav* easily took the value of the definite article, afterwards passing into *he* and being generalized and applied to independent words. The *vav*, therefore, in such an expression as ירחו אסף on the Gezer plaque is the so-called *vav compaginis* and must be read as יֶרַח הָאָסִף, 'month of the fruit-harvest.' We have some instances of this in the Old Testament, in poetic cases or elevated language, as in Gn 1^{24}, חַיְתוֹ־אֶרֶץ ('beast of the earth'), a form which is replaced in v.[25] by חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ (cf. also Ps 50^{10} 79^{2} $104^{11.\ 20}$, Is $56^{9.\ 9}$, Zeph 2^{14}), showing that both forms are syntactically alike. S. R. Driver takes the *vav* in such cases to be an old termination for the nominative singular,[7] but while this may have been one of the original uses of the letter, its replacement in v.[25] by *he* (inadvertently omitted by him in his quotation from this verse) shows that it had the determinative force to which we refer. In the Gezer inscription the *vav* is absent in those cases where the following noun could not have the definite article, except in one case (l. 7), where its absence is evidently due to the inexperience of the writer, who appears to have been a simple peasant.

These changes in Hebrew writing by the time of Ahab, including the deviations from the Phœnician, show considerable intellectual development. It is probable that the Israelites had been in possession of writing for many ages before this and had made constant use of it. David, we are told, wrote a letter to Joab, and there were certainly State annalists in his reign (2 S 8^{16} 20^{25}), and probably records going back to a remote period. Earlier still Samuel is said to have written a description of the first Israelite kingdom in a book (סֵפֶר). According to Hugo Winckler and others,[8] the Babylonian cuneiform was the official mode of writing in the two kingdoms up to the time of Hezekiah (*c.* 722), and certain Biblical terms have been interpreted accordingly. But there is no evidence for this. The cuneiform, which was better adapted than the Egyptian for writing Semitic, was certainly employed in Canaan in the fourteenth century as the diplomatic language, according to the Tell el-Amarna Letters, but the fact that some of its simplest expressions had to be explained by Canaanite glosses shows that it was not in common use. For everyday purposes it could have had no domination over the vernacular of the people,

[1] Alan H. Gardiner, in *Journal of Egypt. Archæology*, 1916, pp. 1 ff.

[2] As Lenormant first suggested, or from the Egyptian hieratics as his pupil De Rougé argued (*Mémoire sur l'origine de l'alphab. phen.*, 1874).

[3] Dussaud, 'Les Inscript. phén. du tombeau d'Ahiram,' *Syria*, v. pp. 135–137.

[4] A list of these is given in Dussaud, 'Samarie au temps d'Achab,' *Syria*, 1926, p. 334, footnotes.

[5] *P.E.F. Quarterly Statement*, 1909, pp. 27 ff.; Lidzbarski, *Ephem. für semit. Epigraphik*, iii. pp. 36 ff., 279 ff.

[6] Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, 122.

[7] *The People and the Book*, p. 83.

[8] Winckler, *Altoriental. Forschungen*, iii. 1902, pp. 165 ff.; Benzinger, *Hebr. Archæol.*, 2nd ed. p. 176.

especially after the Israelites secured possession of the land. During the Israelite monarchy at least, Hebrew must have been the official mode of writing. The Israelites must have used it constantly for this purpose generations before Ahab. According to the discoveries of M. Montet at Byblos, the Phœnician alphabet, with which the ancient Hebrew one has such close affinities, was in a perfect condition by the thirteenth century, and must have been widely used even at that early epoch.[1]

One particularly interesting fact for the Biblical critic, pointed out by Reisner, is that out of twenty-one names of places mentioned on these *ostraka*, six are found in Numbers (26^{30-33}) and Joshua ($17^{2.3}$) as names of clans or tribal divisions in Manasseh. It may be that some of these names of towns and villages arose from the Manasseh clans having first colonized them, for many place-names in Palestine have arisen in a similar way. Seeing, however, that they were clearly in existence as localities as far back as Ahab's time (*c.* 875), the probability is that the redactor, who certainly lived after this time, took them to represent or to account for the clans. The six names referred to are Abi'ezer, Ḥeleq, Shekem, Shamida', No'a, and Ḥogla. As the first four have a masculine termination, and the remaining two a feminine one, he has included the former among the male descendants and the latter among the female. Thus, according to J's genealogy, the first four (along with other three, Asriel, Hepher, and Machir, doubtless towns also) are 'sons' of Manasseh; in P these four (along with Asriel and Hepher) are sons of Gilead, who is given as a grandson of Manasseh, while the two last (along with Maḥlah, Milcah, and Tirzah, towns also) are 'daughters' of Zelophehad, a grandson of Gilead. It is apparent that such genealogical schemes are different attempts to correlate and account for the names of the localities referred to. Long ago Kuenen pronounced Zelophehad's 'daughters' to be really towns, but it has been left to these *ostraka* to prove definitely not only this but that Manasseh's 'sons' are towns also. The incorrectness of the redactor is manifest from the mention of Shekem, which has been easily identified with the Biblical Shechem (Roman Neapolis, modern *Nāblus*). As this town is referred to in the papyrus Anastasi I. as far back as the XIXth Egyptian Dynasty (*c.* 1321–1210 B.C.),[2] and even in the Tell el-Amarna Letters (*c.* 1830),[3] it is clear that one cannot find in it the name of a son of Gilead; and it can hardly be doubted that the remaining names are not those of persons either, but of places, estates, or tribal districts.

The identification of several of the towns mentioned on the *ostraka* has been satisfactorily made by Reisner, Dussaud,[4] Abel,[5] and others. Only a few are unknown or doubtful. Of the six referred to above, Abi'ezer (which appears as 'Jeezer' in Nu 26^{30}, owing to the *beth* having disappeared) seems to be identical with the Abisaros of Josephus,[6] modern *Bisarîye*, a few miles north-west of Samaria (Guérin, ii. p. 214). It may be that the name Abi'ezer was applied to Ophrah, a town in which the Abiezrite clan was settled (Jg $6^{11.24}$), and which disappears from the Biblical records after Samuel's time. No'ah, which is probably the same as Ne'ah (Jos 19^{13}), is believed to be the New Testament Nain (Ναΐν, Lk 7^{11}), the modern *Nein*, placed by Eusebius and St. Jerome in the neighbourhood of Endor,[7] which belonged to Manasseh (Jos 17^{11}). Owing to the influence of the Greek pronunciation, the *'ain* has disappeared (though it remains in the Talmud, Na'im [8]), as it also has in 'Endor (modern *Endur*). Ḥogla, the writer would suggest, is probably identical with Beth-Ḥoglah (Jos 15^{6} 18^{19}), modern *Kasr Ḥadjlah*, south-east of Jericho, for this place, if not actually within Manasseh's territory (the boundary of which is nowhere precise), must have been only four or five miles beyond it, and may easily have belonged to this tribe. Ḥeleq and Shamida' have not been identified so far, though attempts have been made by scholars.

The *ostraka*, as already stated, contain notes or accounts of oil and wine received by the governors or stewards of the palace, evidently for royal purposes. They are really accompanying notes (similar to way-bills) sent with the oil or wine, and they naturally mention only the bare essentials. Thus, *ostrakon* No. 1 (from a fragment of a flaring bowl of reddish-brown ware) says: '*In the 10th year (sent) to Shemaryo from (the town of) Be'er-yam jar(s) of old (wine); (viz.) Rage' (son of)*[9] *Elisha'* 2, *'Uzza (son of)* . . . 1, *Eliba (son of)* . . . 1, *Ba'ala*

[1] Cf. Contenan, *La Civilization phénicienne*, 1926, p. 325.

[2] *Egyptian Hieratic Texts*, i. 1, *The Papyrus Anastasi I.*, by Alan H. Gardiner.

[3] Knudtzon, No. 289.

[4] 'Samarie au temps d'Achab,' in *Syria*, vii. pp. 9 ff.

[5] *Revue biblique*, 1911, pp. 290 ff.

[6] *Ant. Jud.*, VI. xiii. 8.

[7] *Onomasticon*, 94. 23, and 140. 3.

[8] Neubauer, *Géogr. du Talmud*, p. 188.

[9] The expression 'son of' is omitted on the *ostraka*, as generally in Arabic.

(*son of*) *Elisha'* (1), *Yeda'yo* (*son of*) . . . (1),' which means that Shemaryo, a royal steward, received contributions of wine from the town of Be'er-yam, and the names of the consigners are added, with the number of jars that each furnished. The word used for year is שׁת (instead of שׁנת), as in the Moabite inscription and the Neopunic ones. Again, No. 13 (from a jar of grey ware baked pinkish buff), as deciphered by Albright and Dussaud, says, '*In the year* 10 (*sent*) *from* (*the town of*) *Abi'ezer to Shemaryo a jar of old wine* (נבל ין ישן). *To Isha* (*a jar of old wine*) *from* (*the town of*) *Tetel.* Here Shemaryo and Isha (probably hypocoristic for Ish-Ba'al) are the names of royal stewards. A third example, No. 19 (from a similar piece of grey ware), says, '*In the year* 10 *from* (*the town of*) *Yaṣot a jar of fine oil* (נבל שמן רחץ) *to Ahino'am.*' A fourth example, No. 17 (written on a similar fragment), reads as follows: '*In the year* 10 (*sent*) *from Azzah to Gaddiyo a jar of fine oil* (נבל שמן רחץ).' In the two latter cases שמן רחץ probably means oil for anointing the body, corresponding to רֵאשִׁית שְׁמָנִים, 'choice oil,' which was used for this purpose (Am 6[6]). The regions around Samaria were noted for the purity of the oil which they produced, for Josephus tells us that vast sums of money were made by John of Gischala through selling the pure oil (ἔλαιον *καθαρόν*) of Galilee to the Jews of Cæsarea, who could not secure such oil there and would not be dependent on the Greeks.[1]

It was Solomon who first introduced an organized system of royal stewards, and the kings of Israel seem to have continued it or copied it. The *ostraka*, indeed, confirm the historical accuracy of 1 K 4, where we are informed that the upkeep of Solomon's house, his personnel, and his cavalry was attended to by twelve prefects or stewards (נִצָּבִים) whose names are given,[2] each of whom took his turn for a month at a time, securing the necessary supplies from a district allocated to him. These officers did not displace the tribal chiefs, but were merely purveyors or providers for the king, his *annonæ curatores*. The daily consumption was enormous (vv.[22. 23]), but the supplies were not all required for Jerusalem: some of them, destined for the horses and swift steeds, were brought to the place where the king happened to be (v.[28]), and there were also chariot and cavalry centres outside the capital (1 K 10[26]). The arrangements in the northern kingdom were probably based on those in Jerusalem. We read, for instance, of Obadiah, one of Ahab's stewards, searching during the famine for grass to keep the king's horses and mules alive. It is also recorded that Elah, who was king of Israel about twelve years before Ahab, was assassinated by Zimri, a cavalry officer, while he was intoxicated in the house of his steward, which goes to show that the latter had charge of the contributions of wine. The inscriptions on the *ostraka* thus seem to be in accord with the arrangements referred to in the Biblical history.

The inscriptions give us the names of royal stewards (the consignees), the districts under their charge, the consignments of oil and wine received, and in many cases the names of the consigners. The names of at least a dozen stewards are mentioned, and each one seems to have operated on a fixed district. The names of the stewards are: Ahino'am, Shemaryo[3] (=Shemariah), Gaddiyo (=Gaddiah or Gaddiel), Isha (son of) Aḥimelek, Ḥanan (son of) Ba'ara, Gamar (=Gomer), Yeda'yo (=Jedaiah), Ḥeleṣ, Bedyo (=Bedeiah), Ba'alzamar, Hannino'am, Aḥima. All of these except the last three are Biblical names, and Ba'alzamar is a known Phœnician name. Among the senders of contributions there are also many with Biblical names, such as Ahaz, Elisha', Meriba'al,[4] 'Abedyo (=Obadiah), Sheba', 'Uzza, Ela, Gera, Rafa, Nathan, and others, while some have Phœnician parallels. Judging from the numerous senders, the provisioning of Ahab's household, added to the cost of his superb 'ivory palace,' must have been a large burden on his subjects. With the help of Amos and contemporary history we can picture the social life that went on, especially in the royal household and among the upper classes. Under the influence of Jezebel, the halls of the extensive palace must have witnessed many a scene of luxury and extravagance.

Unfortunately, in spite of the valuable work of the Harvard archæologists, only a small part of the space within the walls of Samaria has been excavated. Searchers might yet light on the royal tombs, in which so many Israelite kings rest, or on the site of the temple of Melkarth, or on the ruins of the temple of Astarte, which was still in existence when the town was destroyed. For the magnificent work already accomplished, however, the Harvard excavators have earned the gratitude of all Biblical scholars.

[1] Joseph. *I.life*, 13.

[2] 1 K 4[8ff.]. From vv.[8-14] the names of the stewards have lapsed, and 'son of' only remains.

[3] Such names on the *ostraka* end in יו instead of the Biblical יהוּ or יָהּ.

[4] Meriba'al was the name of Jonathan's son, which the redactors changed to Mephibosheth (1 Ch 8[34]).

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Rust.[1]

'The rust of them shall be a witness against you.'—Ja 5[3].

You know what rust is, don't you? 'Of course,' you say; 'I once had a knife, and I lost it, and '—— Oh, don't let us start again on that old story, or we'll never get on. For days and days you kept saying, 'Mother, I've lost my knife.' 'Mother, I can't think where I've put my knife.' 'Mother, *please*, do look for my knife.' But you never found it at the time. Months afterwards, out in the garden, you came on it one day. And the handle dropped off when you touched it; and the blades would hardly open; and even when they did, they were not one little bit of use. They were all covered over with a red, dusty, furry kind of thing that came off on your hands, and yet seemed to leave about as much as ever where it came from. Well, that of course was rust. And it cost you some shillings, you remember. For your knife wouldn't cut any more, and you had to go and buy a new one. But all over the world there are things made of steel and iron far bigger than a knife, hundreds of miles of railways, and bridges over countless rivers, and ships, great ships, huge Atlantic liners, and heaps and heaps more one can't stop to talk about. And if men don't keep watching all these things, the rust will get at them, and will eat in and in, and round and round about, until it makes a kind of sore upon the iron or the steel. When you have a pain you cry out. That's what pain is for. It's the red light that lets the man driving the engine know that there is something ahead that shouldn't be there, and so he stops his train until things are put right for him. But steel doesn't feel pain and iron can't speak, and so the rust sore grows and grows, until the rails may get so bad that they have to be taken up, and the bridges aren't safe any longer and must be rebuilt; and the ships have to be docked and scraped and cleaned. And that takes time, and that means money, so much waste indeed that a wise man who knows about these things thinks that every year rust costs the world—what do you think? Put down a five. Got that? Well, now a nothing, and another, and another, and another, and another, and another, and two more—till they are like the long tail of a kite—£500,000,000, all lost each year by rust.

But there's another rust, and it wastes more by far even than the first. You couldn't make enough nothings this time to add it up, however long you tried. For this horrible kind of rust eats away lives that might have been how splendid, till they tumble to pieces; and clever minds that might have helped us all so much, yet nothing comes of them; and all the jolly things in boys and girls who used to be decent, but who aren't that any more, because rust has got at them and spoiled them. Perhaps in your class there is a boy who used to do quite well, who kept a good bit up the class, who was an honest little fellow at his lessons, doing them thoroughly night after night. And then there came an evening when he was tired perhaps, or else some game was on, and he just did them anyhow. And at school next day he got off, or else he didn't. Any way he ceased to care, got slacker and slacker, and lazier and lazier, slipped down and down the class, until his last report said, 'Used to be a good pupil, but has gone all to pieces.' But hallo! isn't this your name at the head of that report?

Or you were once a straight little chap, manly and obedient and well mannered. And people went away saying how lucky Mother was to have such a fine boy. But do they say that now? You used to dart off cheerily as soon as you were sent, and got up at once when you were called, and did what you were told as a boy and a soldier should. But one night you were deep in a book, a dreadfully exciting book, when Mother wanted you; and you just growled out something and read on. And since then somehow you have grown slower and slower, and crosser and crosser, and grumpier and grumpier. The rust has got at you, and look what a sad mess it has made of things! Didn't you know?

Well, what are we to do now we do see it all? The rusty rails have to come up, and the bridges may have to be taken down, if they are very bad. And must we too be thrown aside as useless? No. I know two little brothers, one is eight and one fifteen. The younger one has a motor car that runs with real electricity. And he was very proud of it until one day he saw another toy car that had lamps that really lit and really shone. And he did so wish his car had lamps too! And so his brother

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

searched about and found all kinds of old and useless things that had been thrown away. He got some rusty wire and cleaned it, and some stupid-looking rubbish that he made into a splendid battery, and the little eyes of an electric torch—any old things at all. And the torch's eyes he fashioned into the lamps, and soldered them in cleverly, and made a little switch. And so when the small brother, home from school, got out his car, and, down upon the floor was wishing and wishing his car had got lamps, he started and he looked at it again. For there were lamps, real lamps ! And when he touched the little switch they really lit and really burned ! And it was all made out of some old rusty things that had been thrown away. But no one has such clever hands as Jesus Christ. Out of the rustiest, crabbedest, sulkiest boy He can make such a glorious little chap. With just our crossness and our peevishness to work with, He can change us into lights that really shine. Let's take it all to Him, the whole mess we have made of things, these rusty, useless, selfish little hearts of ours, and He will make a great thing of them yet.

The Mark of the Beast.[1]

'Beware of dogs.'—Ph 3[2].

Dogs are pets and faithful friends with us ; in the East they are outcasts and scavengers, and when a man wants to call any one by a vile and insulting name, he calls him 'a dog.' So when St. Paul wanted to describe some mean, underhand, slinking folk who were making trouble he called them 'dogs' and warned the Christians to beware of them.

Well, here is a story of a dog. Everybody likes dog-stories : Ulysses' hound that recognized him at his home-coming when nobody else did ; Llewellyn's Gelert who saved the young prince and was killed by the hasty father ; Greyfriars' Bobby : these are all pleasant stories about dogs. This is not so pleasant.

It is written on a brick in the British Museum, which bears the imprint of a dog's paw, the mark of the beast. Thousands of years ago in Babylon the brickmakers were at their work, making bricks of moist soft clay, moulding them very carefully, for they were for the king's palace. As each brick was finished, it was stamped with the king's mark and set out to dry and harden in the hot sun.

Noonday came and the workmen went off for their midday meal. In the sun the sentry drowses. A dog comes slinking up to see what it can steal. Suddenly the sentry notices and shouts and hurls a stone. The dog scurries for the gate, but the mischief has been done. One paw has trodden on a brick and left its mark right on the top of the mark of the king, blotting it out. There will be trouble for the unfaithful sentry, and the brick is spoiled for its high purpose. An unclean thing has touched it and left its mark.

So out it goes into the rubbish heap, and there it lies buried under the dust for thousands of years, till at last it is dug up and brought with many others to London to tell its silent sermon of how the mark of the beast defaced the mark of a king and wasted the work of his servants.

It is the story of many lives. Moulded in God's image, stamped with His character, meant to be part of His building, they have been spoiled. The watchman dozed, conscience slept, and some beastly thing set its unclean foot where the print of God's finger had been, and they were no use for God and goodness. They went into the rubbish heap, cast out, outcasts.

You see them in the Bible. Mary Magdalene was once a sweet, innocent girl, clean and pure from the hand of God. But an unclean thought stole into her heart and set its foot on its beauty, and she became an evil thing. You find her, Jesus found her, on the rubbish heap of life—'a woman of the city which was a sinner.'

Zacchæus was once a decent, honest lad. But a slinking, greedy, sneaking thought stamped itself on the soft clay of his nature, and he became a swindler and a cheat, another outcast.

And that would have been all their story, like the story of the brick, had it not been that it was Jesus who found them in the rubbish heap. For He can do with souls what workmen can't do with spoiled bricks : He can blot out the mark of the beast and restore the stamp of God's image. He is a Saviour. He did that with Mary Magdalene and with Zacchæus and the woman of Samaria. He made them again, bricks fit for the building of God. He can do that for any one, and He is the only one who can.

That is great news, and good news. But here is better. He can keep us from the beginning so that the beast shall never set his mark on us, and the mark of the king shall be as clear and undefaced at the end as at the beginning.

And this is, above all, news for you young folk. Your nature is like soft clay now, ready to take any impression. That is what 'character' means. It means 'stamp,' 'impression.' You are God's handiwork ; you come from Him ; you are His ;

[1] By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Glasgow.

His stamp is on you and He means you to live for Him.

How are you going to keep His mark unblotted? It is not easy. Watchers may nod. Fathers and mothers can't see everything. Your own conscience may sleep, and some prowling, slinking evil set its ugly mark on you.

One sees faces in the street stamped with the stamp of evil as plainly as a sheep is marked with ochre. They weren't always like that. There was an artist once who used a beautiful boy as a model for a picture of the Infant Jesus. His face was pure and innocent. Years afterwards he wanted a model for a picture of evil. He found one in the street and paid him to sit; and he found out that it was the same person! The boy who had served for a likeness of Christ had grown up, and the mark of things beastly had quite blotted out the stamp of God.

Girls and boys, you are meant to be real 'little bricks,' as we say. We know what we mean when we say, 'He's a brick!' and all who love you want to be able to say it of you, even God Himself. You are His bricks to build His Holy City. His stamp is on you in the beginning. He made you and moulded you. The only way to keep His image unspoiled and His mark undefaced is to give yourselves now to Christ to keep. It is good to know the Saviour who restores and remakes and redeems the life that has gone wrong, and rescues that outcast from the rubbish heap. But it is best of all to know the Saviour who can keep us from the beginning; and you can know Him now.

The Christian Year.

Second Sunday in Lent.

The Disturbing Dream.

'Wherefore look ye so sadly to-day? And they said unto him, We have dreamed a dream, and there is no interpreter of it.'—Gn $40^{7, 8}$.

It was not their dungeon, but their dream, that so disturbed Joseph's fellow-prisoners that morning. 'Wherefore look ye so sadly to-day?' said Joseph to Pharaoh's officers, as he went his round of the prison. And they did not reply, 'Because we languish in prison; because we have lost a very good job; because our chances of promotion are seriously imperilled; because we are worrying about our wives and children.' They were sad, they said, because they had dreamed a dream.

One of the most arresting features of our age is the sad aspect of men and women to-day. There is something pathetic even about their frenzied pursuit of pleasure. Shades of the prison-house, as Wordsworth has warned us, begin to close about us all as life goes on. We grow conscious of our limitations, and as those sober-liveried warders, Age and Infirmity, begin to visit us in their rounds, we grow more sensitive to the clank of chains and the creaking of locks. But none of these things is the real cause of our distress. Man has an amazing capacity for adjustment to environment. It is not his dungeon, but his dream, that makes him look so sadly to-day. Dreams can be much more disturbing things than dungeons, a fancy far more painful than a fetter. It is the thing that has come to us from outside the prison that is so perturbing, the vision of that which we might have been, of the place which we might have filled. All the restless seeking, all the discontent, is evidence that man has dreamed of something better than prison fare, some loftier destiny, some ampler sphere. The world's trouble is that of the dream that finds no explanation or fulfilment.

'Do not interpretations belong to God?' said Joseph to the sad-visaged prisoners. 'Tell it me, I pray you.' How men long for sympathy and understanding, an ear in which they can tell their dreams and whisper their desires! The world to-day, looking so sad after its long and broken night, needs some one who will take it back to God, some one who will encourage it to give its confidence. 'Do not interpretations belong to God? Tell it me, I pray you.' Joseph is not too busy to stop and listen to the story of the strange, perplexing dream.

That is why the Man Christ Jesus is saving the world from despair once again, because He visits each in the narrow confines of his cell, seeing the troubled look, and inviting the confidence of each sufferer. He takes us back to God. He explains life to us, showing us for what we were meant. He came down and shared our prison fare in order that He might do this thing for us. 'Tell it me, I pray you,' says the voice which speaks as never man spake. And they tell it, 'each man his dream.' He knows; He makes it plain. It takes One who was tried in all points like as we are, yet without sin, to tell us the meaning of life, and the heart of man turns to that interpreter of dreams, with His tender tones, so healing of the world's sadness, 'Tell me, I pray you.'

Have we grasped the meaning of that yearning which sometimes rocks the very soul? The artist flings his canvas aside; the author tears up his MS.; the musician still seeks the lost chord; the

social reformer is impatient with the slow-moving wheels of progress; the scholar pursues an endless research; the scientist finds that one discovery but beckons him on to another; the captain of industry scraps the ever inadequate plant; the explorer sails on and on. 'Wherefore look ye so sadly to-day?' Because yesterday we were content to awake from a dreamless sleep, and had no thoughts above the trough. But to-day we are thralls of a dream. Last night we inhabited a prison, and were not ill-content: to-day we are unhoused by a dream, pilgrims of a discontent.

Joseph was the very man to trust with the secret of a dream, for he, too, had been a dreamer of dreams. 'Tell it me, I pray you,' says a greater than Joseph. In His words and in His deeds, in His life and in His death, He has shown us all. He came to tell us that this yearning for freedom is the earnest of our inheritance; that it is no delusion of the night, the offspring of sorrow and despair, that we shall yet stand before the King, and serve Him at His table. He has shown us that there is no destiny too high, no dream too exalted, for the prisoners who are continuing a season in ward. There is no key to life save that which Jesus offers.

When we see that vacant look upon the faces of the pleasure-seekers; when we see that hunted look upon the faces of so many of the workers, that anxious look upon the faces of the great employers of labour who have to find work for all; when we see that wistful look upon the faces of so many young men and women who are facing life with all its possibilities, we know their need. They need an interpreter, some one who will explain them to themselves and show them the meaning and the opportunities of life. They have each and all dreamed of a better world, of a healthier society, of a nobler destiny, of a happier outlook. The heart of man has dreamed great dreams; but to-day there is sadness everywhere, for he has lost the key to their interpretation.

One evening some of us heard Chopin's great Nocturne in C Sharp Minor played by that wonderful little elfin old man who interprets Chopin to us as none other living can do. The printed programme set forth the usual banal explanations of what people have thought was in Chopin's mind and heart before he sobbed it forth upon the strings. One said, 'It is the gloomiest and grandest of Chopin's moody canvases'; another, 'The sudden outburst of quickly passing passion followed by accents of despair—all of which seem to speak of the tragedies of life.' But those of us who heard will never forget how, before he seated himself at the piano, the little *maestro* came forward with that unearthly smile of his, and told us the secret. 'I must tell you; it is very interesting. Chopin told Liszt, and Liszt told me. In this piece all is sorrow and trouble—oh! such sorrow and trouble—until he begins to speak to God, to pray; and then it is all right.' That is the burden of all the low-toned nocturnes of life. All is sorrow and trouble until we turn to God.

A wonderful sense of peace must have stolen into the hearts of Pharaoh's two officers as they unburdened themselves into Joseph's sympathetic ear. His interpretations must have brought the two men great comfort and great strength, the one to live and the other to die. It makes all the difference when we know that the issue of our lives, whatsoever it may prove, is not the accident of chance, but part of an ordered plan. It is the uninterpreted life that is hard to live. It is the uncertainty that torments. If we knew that we would glorify God either by living or by dying, either were easy to accept.

It is neither the mystery of life nor the fear of death that brings an ache to our hearts when we sit alone with our thoughts. The sadness is in this, that we know we were made for bigger and better things than we have ever yet reached. We may be certain, however, that if our dreams and visions are lofty, we shall not be left to languish in doubt and uncertainty for ever. For our dreams are ever where our treasure lies. And if they are about the dignity of service, of pouring the red wine of life into the King's own cup, watching the blossoms of endeavour shoot forth, as that old Egyptian officer watched them in his so vivid dream, we know that we shall never be mocked of Him who sends the dream and holds its key. And if the issue of our dream should be other, and the thieving birds should snatch from our basket the bakemeats of life, all that we have toiled to prepare for the royal banquet, then we shall get something better than bakemeats. For, whether we seem to succeed or whether we imagine that we have failed, we know that we are His. It is ours only to think of our King and how best we may serve Him according to our differing gifts. And then, whether our dream leads to promotion in service here or to promotion in higher courts, we know that we are doing God's will; and that brings peace. Ours is the part greatly to dream: the interpretations belong to God.

'After three days,' said Joseph; and so it came to pass. There was no prison in all the land of

Egypt that could hold men who could dream like that. 'After three days,' we Christian folk repeat; for it was not possible that hell and the grave with combined force could hold in their prison-house the sympathy and the understanding and the love that dwelt in Jesus.

And still He comes to each of us who is conscious of his limitations, comes to them that are in ward in what is after all the Master's house, saying, 'Wherefore look ye so sadly to-day?' 'And they said unto him, We have dreamed a dream, and there is none that can interpret it. And he said unto them, Do not interpretations belong to God? tell it *me*, I pray you.'[1]

THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Presence of Christ the Church's Supreme Need.

'Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.'—Eph 5^{14}.

'Lo! I am with you all the days': if that is really so, how do we venture to make the assertion that the supreme *need* of the hour in the life of the Church is the presence of Christ?

One of the greatest pictures in the whole of the New Testament is a dark house showing dimly through the swiftly gathering gloom. And on the threshold, in a listening attitude, stands a radiant Form. With upraised hand He knocks, and listens, and then knocks again. Patient the face is, and gentle, but infinitely sad. Sometimes it seems that in all the Bible there is no picture so ravishingly winsome and tender; sometimes that there is no picture so charged with rebuke, so vocal with Divine Judgment. For, see! whose is that white and startled face, that looks out, with a drowsy trouble in the eyes, through the dark window's curtains drawn for a moment aside? It is the spirit of a Church that had fallen sound asleep. Inside, the room was cold and dark. The table was unfurnished. The ashes on the hearth were spent.

What a world of tragic possibilities that picture thrusts before our eyes! Christ present *always* with His Church on earth: but it makes all the difference in the world whether He is within the house, or whether He has been compelled by our unfaithfulness to stand on the threshold knocking at the door.

Is Christ within, or left standing at the door to-day? Is He perchance within, but not as our honoured Guest? He *is* present—that much is very sure. But do we realize His presence? From that tremendous personality there have flowed time and again into human life streams of healing, quickening, uplifting—flood-tides which have changed the course of history, which have refreshed and renewed the face of the dry, parched land. Why is it not so to-day?

When Balaam stood on the heights and looked down on the camp of Israel his tongue was held from cursing. He said:

How shall I curse whom God hath not cursed?
How shall I defy whom the Lord hath not defied?

The Lord his God is with him,
And the shout of a king is among them:

How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob,
And thy tabernacles, O Israel!

But to-day all the so-called prophets of the world are standing on the heights looking down at the Church, and their curses are unrestrained. Why? Because they hear no more the rustle and the shouting as the King passes through the camp. Yes, that is the only thing that will silence the criticism of the Church to-day: the realized presence of the Lord in her midst again, making her rise up to do His service with a new consciousness of power. Not that we need pay too much heed to what the critic has to say. It is enough to mark the fact that he *is* speaking. There is only one Critic who has the right to be heard by the Church; and that is the Church's Master and Lord. And He speaks to us through our own consciences.

Are we not conscious that much of the old radiancy of faith and trust has faded from the face of Christ's Bride? And is it not true that it is because the certitude, the assurance of His presence has grown somewhat dim and faint? For one reason or other an estrangement has fallen between us and our Lord. We will not say we have thrust Him out to the door again. In many a corner of the Church His presence is recognized with joy. He is still inside, a guest perhaps among the company, but all eyes are not towards Him. He might be dead for all the attention multitudes nominally within the Church are paying to Him. There is a widespread indifference to-day to the simple fact, nay, the tremendous fact that Jesus is alive. Jesus *is* alive! But we are concerned about other matters, busy about mere externalities.

What would the realized presence of Christ mean for us? What a difference it made to multitudes that Jesus once lived in their midst. Hard hearts, embittered lives, tired folk and

[1] H. L. Simpson, *Put Forth by the Moon*, 26.

broken, looked in His face and saw there a light so winsome that they came, they could not tell why, to unburden to Him all their care and shame. And often, in many another scene with this simple workman in the midst, there were tremblings and shrinkings and tears and shame. Men drew away back from Him, as if His presence were the judgment-seat of God. And excitement spread over the face of the land. It was all so simple and wonderful. And something within the hearts of the people began to stir and wake. 'Never man spake like this,' they said. The Lord hath visited His people.

It was to them as wonderful as it would be to us to-day to hear strange news breaking out of the skies from heaven. He was the shadow of a great rock in a weary land—a land where dead souls wandered, crushed by superstitions, broken and embittered by injustice, oppression, and wrong, the sky all blotted out by the tangled growth of the Rabbis' traditions, the ways all blown over by the desert sands of their weary rules and maxims; and all the longings of the soul for the presence of God dried like the brooks in a summer's drought—until this Man came. And lo, the nightmare was broken by a beam of heavenly splendour! The great God had burst the awful bars of spiritual death that had shut Him out. The people heard God calling in the looks and tones and gestures of this Man. And they cried, 'Lord, to whom can we go but unto thee? Thou hast the words of eternal life.'

Many a time has He visited the world since then. After the crowning hour of ecstasy at Pentecost, when all the company became filled with the spiritual presence of the risen Lord, the disciples went out to stir Jerusalem to its depths. Thousands believed: 'Jesus is alive! He is at the right hand of Power! This which ye see in us is proof of it.' And from that city they went forth over the length and breadth of the dying civilization of the Græco-Roman world. That was the first great coming again of Christ after the Resurrection, the first realization of His presence with power. The Resurrection may be 'the land where the great mists lie, but it is the land whence the great rivers flow.' Every revival, every reformation, every uprising of a down-trodden principle of the kingdom He planted to take its stern but glorious revenge has been a fresh proof of the Resurrection. He is not dead. He is alive. But because of our faithlessness, we do not realize His presence. We are His doors of access to the world. He is longing to come again with power. But the doors are barred with pride and doubt.

What must we do?

1. What must we do *to realize His presence in ourselves as individuals*? We must turn in on ourselves again. It is not the excitement of the crowds that is going to bring the Lord Christ down. As a nation, we have been living too long on the surface of life. In the Church we have been covering too long the poverty of our faith by a babble of religious small-talk. We want to get alone with ourselves in the presence of God. And in that solemn interview with ourselves we must remember the searching eyes of the Spirit of Christ are on us, lest we deal too leniently with ourselves. Let us listen to all this inner unrest, this inward whispering that all is not well, this longing for the old spring of gladness—longing for a fresh baptism of power. Make a fresh beginning with Him in prayer, in penitence and lowliness of mind. And He will make a fresh beginning with us.

2. What more must we do *to realize Christ's presence in the Church*? The first essential is this. We have got to learn all over again the true secret of Christian fellowship. Not in big conferences. We come into the presence of the crowds not to discover truth, but to proclaim it, and have our hearts confirmed by it. It is the secret of the quiet gatherings of the two or three we need to learn again. For it is there men come to discover truth, to wait for God, to pray, to glimpse new visions, to make fresh adventures of exploration into the unsearchable riches of the vast heart of God. If by God's Spirit we could learn to break the frost of our close reserve about things unseen; if we could learn to meet with the two or three, it may be not always to say only what we believe, nor yet to say what we think we ought to believe; if we came in absolute candour to tell each other our misgivings and doubts, yea, even to voice that old, sad, broken-hearted cry, 'But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel'; but always if we came to pray, surely our hearts would begin to burn within us, for lo, He would be talking with us by the way!

3. And what must we do *to make Christ's presence known to all the world*? It is not more organization the Church needs. It is Power, the Spirit's Power, the Power of the living, active presence of Christ. It is not new methods in the first place. The Power would forge these for itself. We want to get the fire of the Spirit rekindled on the hearth. That alone will bring the people to the house of God. It is the glimmer of firelight through the windows that draws the benighted wanderer home. If the house remain dark and cold, what matter

though it be swept and garnished? It is only devils—of bad temper and strife and suspicion and jealousy and fear—that return to hold high revel in such a place.

But if we become as little children again, conscious that we have missed our way, we will begin to realize the presence of Christ within, and the world will begin to take knowledge of us that we have been, and are, with Jesus. Men will look on the Church as they looked on St. Francis of Assisi and his shining company: they will see it 'fragrant with a wondrous aspect.' And the power that this poor, worn, and spent world needs will begin to flow into human life again. Christ will become recognized as the Healer, the Peacemaker, the Lord and Prince of life, ushering in the day of His Kingdom.

It is coming, very surely coming. There are signs of it everywhere, not only in the Church but in the world. The world's great writers, poets, dreamers are proclaiming that it is a Christ-haunted world. They are coming back to His feet to ask Him all the most terrible questions of life. The day of a new appearing, another of the days of the Son of Man is most certainly on the way.[1]

FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Illusion of Arithmetic.

'There is a lad here.'—Jn 6^9.

The feeding of the five thousand did not take place as a demonstration of supernatural power. When Jesus saw that it was interpreted in that way He immediately left the multitude and went away into the wilderness to be alone.

The story is not intended to fasten our interest upon a transient incident which took place hundreds of years ago, but to teach us eternal principles. The hungry multitude forms a parable. The little boy with his five loaves and two fishes is a parabolic figure. The disciple Philip making his arithmetical calculations is a parable; and the gathering up of the twelve baskets of fragments which remained over and above is also an eternal parable. It is intended to discountenance a certain attitude of mind towards life's forces, which we may call the arithmetical attitude. It is a significant way of teaching that the powers of man, when linked with the powers of the Divine, are capable of incredible amplification. It enshrines a gospel concerning life's remainders.

[1] J. A. Robertson, in *Ascension and Whitsuntide Sermons*, 147.

1. The sum that was set for Philip to work out was absurdly simple. He had only to count the number of people present and then estimate the cost per head of feeding them. Philip based the cost per head at one farthing. It was a simple thing to calculate how many farthings would be required to give each of five thousand people something to eat. It is the arithmetical way of looking at life. We are all rather partial to it. Arithmetic seems to us to be an exact science. We grow weary of problems and speculations. We would like, if we could, to get down to some basis concerning life which is perfectly sure and which never varies from age to age.

2. But it is not so easy even as it appears to estimate loaves and fishes. 'There is a lad here,' and there is something about the lad which confuses all our calculations. Why, Nature herself loves multiplication rather than simple addition. Here are a few seeds, it may be of wheat, and lo, they produce twenty, thirty, or sixtyfold! There is an expulsive multiplying force in Nature which confounds our arithmetic. We are always estimating the power of the world to feed its population. Every now and again, in the newspapers, an estimate is given of the extent of the coming harvest and the potential fertility of one land or another. These forecasts and estimates never get down to the root of things. There is more involved than the mere productivity of the earth. There is always something human, there is always something psychological, which complicates the issue. They tell us every now and again that the earth cannot feed more than an estimated population. But we have never seen yet an earth in which men, in harmony with the Divine, were earnestly intent upon seeing that no son of man went hungry. If we were to see such a thing as that, the feeding of the five thousand in the days of Christ would seem like a mere prophetic gleam of what Nature can do when she and man and God work together in harmony.

3. To go a step farther. When we count men and women we are nearly always wrong. There is no fallacy which has been more often exposed in history than that of counting men. Nobody yet has ever learned to count a crowd. 'There is a lad here.' In importance he may reduce the rest of your crowd to the significance of cyphers. Every notable name in our annals is a name that has confounded arithmetic. Napoleon Bonaparte said once that he was worth an army corps to France; and who can deny him? Would we say that the population of England in the seventeenth century

was so many millions, counting Oliver Cromwell precisely in the same way as we counted the groom who saddled his horse for him? There are millions of examples. Every memorable name is a name that made arithmetic look foolish.

Anybody who loves Robert Louis Stevenson must have resented at first that candid biography by J. A. Steuart, and Lloyd Osborne's revelations of the weak side of that great man. Mr. Strachey made many people angry because he told us so much about Queen Victoria. In America they idealize Abraham Lincoln. He seems to them little less than a patron saint. William Herndon, one of the men who knew him best, wrote another biography with the definite intention of stripping away illusions and showing us a more human, though an intrinsically greater, Lincoln with the little excrescences and deformities he never quite threw off.

There is a mean way of thinking about big men, and there are people who are only too glad to think that way. They present you with their incontrovertible facts, and say, 'Call *him* a great man? Look at his weaknesses, look at his meannesses.' That is your arithmetical calculation, but it is false. They *were* great men in spite of everything. Nay, who knows if they were not perhaps greater because of these things. They let some parts of their life remain undeveloped because they gave such marvellous strength and vitality to certain great aims and causes. The little side is part of the big man, but whoever judges big men by their weaknesses is an arithmetical microbe. There is something 'over and above' in every great life, something we cannot calculate, some expulsive force we cannot analyse.

4. 'Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost'—not the fingered and half-eaten morsels that a careless crowd left to be trampled in the grass, but the broken, yet unused, portions of bread that the disciples had not distributed, because the multitude had enough. They who had merely eaten had nothing over, or what there was was negligible. They who had served had a basket full. It is a parable of eternal significance. There is no question in life more appealing, more significant, than the question of its remainders. We can make our arithmetical estimate. We can calculate the years if we leave a slight margin for uncertainties. What will be left over when life is finished?

The Christian has a deep and sacred belief concerning the recompense of the just upon which one might wax eloquent. But this generation has had its wings clipped; it can take no flights of faith and hope into the world beyond. It is only now that this generation of ours is beginning to let its wings grow again. Faith will come again. It cannot be that this little globe we call the earth, a mere fragment amidst multitudes of worlds greater than itself, is the only sphere of destiny. It cannot be that this half-expended, unexhausted thing we call the human soul has no future beyond the grave. Faith will come again, ah!—but right here and now there is already something in life over and above all arithmetical estimates of its value. There is a lad here—a lad who might put his little basket with its fragments of food into association with the Divine and find himself made bread-giver to the multitude. There is something in us over and above the circumstances which we are facing. There is a Divine grace that can make us adequate.

Let us believe in it more and more. Let us keep on believing in it, let us test it. There is a Divine dynamic that, linked with our human frailty, can make life splendid and marvellously fruitful.[1]

Fifth Sunday in Lent.

The Brands of the Lord Jesus.

'From henceforth let no man trouble me: for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus.'—Gal 6^{17}.

Every one knows the characteristic legend concerning Francis of Assisi, which tells how on his hands and feet and side he bore mysterious crucifixion marks, in token of his spiritual conformity to the Crucified. St. Paul, however, was not thinking about any supernatural stigmata. He was remembering things much simpler and more commonplace. Those scars where the stones cut when they pelted him at Lystra, and those seams where the rods bit when they scourged him at Philippi—it is marks like these that he calls to mind. For the words written of George Fox were still more true of St. Paul: 'Then he grew weakly, being troubled with pains and aches, having had many sore and long travels, beatings, and hard imprisonments.' Soldiers who were crippled in the Great War can feel to-day that they carry in their bodies the seal of their sacrifice for England.

There remains a deep spiritual sense in which the like good confession ought to be possible for every Christian. And we shall understand it when we consider how a brand implies at least three things—ownership, advertisement, and genuineness.

[1] F. W. Norwood, *The Gospel of the Larger World*, 214.

1. A brand implies *ownership*. For this reason farmers brand their sheep, and ranchmen brand their cattle. Within living memory negroes in America were branded by their owners as slaves. The ancient Hebrew law provided that in certain cases a bondsman should have his ear nailed to the doorpost, to show that he was henceforth his master's property for life. In like manner, to bear the brands of Jesus Christ means to have Him for our Owner and Possessor. This idea of ownership helps us to understand why the Apostle could say: 'Henceforth let no man trouble me'; because a slave, just by reason of his slavery, is curiously emancipated from half the anxieties which beset people who belong to themselves or to one another. His master finds him his food and raiment, and sets him his work; and so long as he satisfies his master, he need care little for other men's praise or blame. And so slavery, by a kind of paradox, brings with it also detachment and freedom—freedom from the cares of this world and from the deceitfulness of riches. A strange peace settles into the soul of the man who can say quietly: 'Whether I live, I live unto the Lord; or whether I die, I die unto the Lord; living therefore, or dying, I am the Lord's.'

2. Again, a brand implies *advertisement*. We can instantly pick out a porter at the railway station, or a policeman in the street. Each of them bears it on his body. And ought there not also to be something about a Christian which shows plainly whose he is and whom he serves? We may admit this, without advocating any special religious garments or badges, without defending 'these offensively celestial uniforms,' as Ruskin once called them. Surely the brands of Jesus Christ pierce deeper than a costume. And surely, even in the workaday world, we have sometimes met people who carry about with them the very stamp and signature of goodness.

To advertise our religion is a grave and sacred responsibility. Yet none of us can help doing it. When Père Besson, the French Dominican, went to preach to his countrymen who were in Italy, the Italians themselves flocked to hear him, because they said his face was worth many sermons. Two young Italian soldiers were standing at the edge of the crowd round his pulpit, almost out of reach of the voice which was speaking to them in a strange tongue; and one said to his fellow, 'Look at that man: he is a speaking crucifix!' When we have grace to preach like that, we shall find fewer deaf children sitting in the market-place.

3. Once more, a brand implies *genuineness*. It is the trade mark which guarantees that an article comes from the right factory. Concerning St. Paul, we may say that he was hall-marked with Jesus Christ. And, after all, there is no surer and safer evidence of a genuine Christian than this—that the man reminds us of Christ. People will often wrangle about what they call the notes of the Church, the signs and proofs by which we may distinguish the authentic Communion of the faithful from its spurious imitations. The decisive notes of the Holy Catholic Church must be moral and spiritual tokens. Wherever we meet with a company of Christian men and women who are so tender-hearted, so self-forgetful, so humble, so pure, so brave, that they put us irresistibly in mind of their Saviour, then, though we may dislike some points in their order and their discipline, and we may shrink from some clauses in their creed, yet henceforth let no man trouble us with criticisms and objections: in that fellowship we are conscious of nothing except the wound-prints of Jesus Christ Himself.[1]

[1] T. H. Darlow, *The Love of God*, 236.

The Visit to the Tomb.

By Professor D. S. Margoliouth, D.Litt., Oxford.

The observation of E. Nestle, published long ago in this magazine, that ἐρίσει, 'shall strive' (*i.e.* 'litigate'), in the Greek of Mt 12[19] is a mistranslation of the Lewisian Syriac *nrib*, which is here quoted from the Peshiṭta of Is 42[2], and means 'shout,' which is the sense of the corresponding Hebrew and LXX, might well be the foundation-stone of Synoptic criticism. The present writer has experimented on Jewish scholars, more familiar with Hebrew than with Syriac, and they have fallen into the same mistake. The inference that the Greek is translated from the Lewisian Syriac

or its archetype is confirmed by the existence of many other mistranslations, and several passages wherein the text of quotations from the O.T. is traceable to the Peshitta O.T. Hence the opinion of Merx, that the oldest Gospel is that of Matthew, must be correct. Where scholars of ability claim priority for Mark, their reasons call for examination.

Such a case occurs in the recent work of Maurice Goguel, *Jesus the Nazarene, Myth or History?* This careful writer, speaking of the Visit to the Tomb (Mt 28^{1-10}, Mk 16^{1-8}), remarks (p. 232, Eng. tr.): 'The priority of Mark's narrative compared with that of Matthew is beyond question. The apparition of Jesus to the women is under suspicion; Mark would not have suppressed it if he had found it in the source of his work. It makes a useless repetition of the apparition of the angel.'

This argument loses all force from the fact that Mark's narrative breaks off with the statement that the women told no one anything. Hence for all we know he may have narrated an apparition of Jesus in the sequel.

Now we notice in the first place that, whereas Matthew designates the women as 'Mary the Magdalen and the other Mary,' Mark designates them as 'Mary the Magdalen, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome.' If Matthew had found Salome in his source, why should he omit her? On M. Goguel's own principle Matthew's text must be the earlier.

The two accounts in fact differ so seriously that the question which is the source of the other, or rather what is the relation between the two, cannot be settled quite so simply. Let Matthew's account be considered first.

Mt 28^{1}, 'Now late on the sabbath day, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week.' Here 'began to dawn' (R.V.) is an unfortunate rendering. Since the Sunday began in the evening, the word 'dawn' should be avoided. The Lewisian text means, 'In the evening (on the Sabbath) which preceded the First day,' and this is probably meant by the Greek, 'came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre.' This visit is closely bound up with the Matthæan narrative. The women witness the burial (27^{61}). The Saviour's prophecy that He would rise on the third day is so well known to the Jews that they demand a guard for the tomb, which is also sealed to prevent tampering. This last operation must clearly take place immediately after closing the tomb, else it will be ineffective. The curiosity of the women will be aroused, or their faith evoked, to see whether anything happens on the third day; therefore they come to the tomb in time for the commencement of the third day, *i.e.* the end of the Saturday, when the Sunday is about to begin. They do not indeed witness the Resurrection, but they see the tomb miraculously opened, and the guard disperse in terror. An angel, who has rolled away the stone, tells them that the tomb is empty, and gives them a message to the disciples. On their way to deliver the message they are met by Jesus Himself, who repeats it.

Mark's narrative is as follows (16^{1}): 'And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, bought spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early on the first day of the week, they come to the tomb when the sun was risen.' Here there are two serious differences from the Matthæan narrative. They come to the tomb after sunrise, not at the commencement of the Sunday (*i.e.* Saturday evening); and their object is not to see the tomb, but to exhume the body for the purpose of anointing it, though there was no hint given that the laying-out by Joseph of Arimathæa was incomplete. There can be no doubt that what they contemplated doing, namely, opening the tomb, was illegal; for the tomb was the property of Joseph, and it is not suggested that his permission had been obtained for opening it; indeed, the statement which follows, that on their way they bethought them of the difficulty of removing the stone, shows that this permission had not been obtained: Joseph would have thought of the difficulty, even if the women forgot it. In the second place, the sentiment which abhors disturbing the repose of the dead is so widespread that we cannot believe these women were devoid of it. One of the Caliphs wished to exhume his beloved, because he had not said the proper prayers over her before burial; his courtiers persuaded him not to disturb one whom the earth had covered.[1] Ishodad, who notices the difficulty, compares the practice of bringing fragrant herbs to a grave on the third or seventh day after burial, or on feast-days; a practice which is wholly irrelevant.

Whereas, then, the Matthæan narrative credits the women with an act either of faith or of natural curiosity, Mark substitutes for it a project which

[1] *Aghani*, ed. 2, xiii, 158, 20.

was both illegal and irreverent; and, since that project could not even have been contemplated if the tomb were sealed and guarded, the narrative of the sealing and guarding had to be dropped. The Matthæan narrative further implies that, though the Apostles attached no importance whatever to their Master's prophecy of His resurrection, the Jews regarded it as so important that they took steps to guard against a sham resurrection; and one or more women disciples, perhaps reminded of it by the Jews, had either the faith or the curiosity to be present at the tomb when the third day commenced, to see whether anything happened. The project narrated by Mark makes it certain that these women too had no expectation whatever of a resurrection; at the time when they should have been at the tomb, had they any such expectation, they were buying spices in order to complete the laying-out! And they let the first half of the third day pass before they start for the tomb.

Whereas, then, both narratives make certain women discover that the tomb is empty on the third day, the Matthæan narrative furnishes a natural sequence of events except for the miracle of the opening, which Mark's narrative also implies; whereas that of Mark substitutes a project which was illegal, improper, and impracticable. One would have thought that there was no question here that the Matthæan narrative was original, and had been subjected to radical alterations with the view of rescuing the Apostles from the charge of being less believing than the Jews and less interested in their Master than a couple of women.

The Matthæan narrative also proceeds with natural sequence. The angel who opens the tomb delivers a message to the women who are there to receive it. They start with the view of delivering it, and are rewarded for their faith by an apparition of the Master Himself. In Mark's narrative they recollect, when they are on their way, the difficulty of opening the tomb, which, however, they find already opened. Entering, they see 'a young man sitting on the right side, arrayed in a white robe.' He gives them the message, but only succeeds in frightening them, and they 'said nothing to any one, for they were afraid.' By postponing the visit from the commencement of the Sunday till after sunrise Mark makes the 'young man,' doubtless a mysterious being, wait in the tomb on the chance of visitors arriving to perform an illegal act; for whose visit the antecedents furnish no preparation. His waiting proves to be futile, since the women take no notice of his instructions.

Instead, then, of the Matthæan narrative being taken from Mark, it would seem evident that the author of the Second Gospel has altered the narrative of Matthew with a definite intention—that of minimizing the faith of the women. The narrative thereby becomes valueless: for what it amounts to is, that the women found the tomb unoccupied except for a young man, who delivered a message to them, of which they took no notice. If, as Matthew records, they delivered the message, their visit to the tomb forms an important link in the chain of events; but if they kept their experience to themselves at the time, they could not expect to be credited when they recounted it afterwards.

A relic of the Matthæan account appears in Mark's initial statement that 'when the sabbath was past,' the women bought spices. In Matthew the note of time, when Saturday was ending and Sunday about to commence, is of the utmost importance; the women come to the tomb at the first moment when the prophecy could be fulfilled. But for Mark's narrative the hour at which the spices were purchased is of no importance, except indeed to suggest that the idea of a resurrection had not entered their minds, so that at the very time when it might have been expected they were engaged on an act which excluded the belief in such a possibility. The Fourth Evangelist makes Joseph and Nicodemus so lavish with spices that such a purchase would have been quite unnecessary. The Third Evangelist makes them prepare the spices immediately after witnessing the interment. He also increases the number of the women, which the Fourth Evangelist reduces to Mary the Magdalene. The analogy suggested by Ishodad would suit her visit to the tomb as it appears in this last narrative.

The examination of the narratives bears out the proposition of Merx that the genuine Palestinian tradition is to be found chiefly in Matthew, and, it may be added, in the original Syriac.

Recent Foreign Theology.

German Theology.

The Book of Malachi has been subjected to an amazingly exhaustive treatment by Alexander von Bulmerincq. He has written a volume[1] of five hundred and twelve large pages, which is only an Introduction, to be followed by a second volume of Commentary, and the Bibliography alone runs to fifty-five pages. Every conceivable phase of the subject is treated, the prophet's name, his times, his relation to Ezra-Nehemiah, his literary style, his theology, the authenticity of the disputed pages, etc. Unlike many learned books, it is a thoroughly living book and interesting from beginning to end. Its general spirit is conservative; the writer, for example, defends the traditional order Ezra-Nehemiah as against the recent tendency to put Ezra about half a century later than Nehemiah. He argues that Malachi was born probably about 515 B.C., and died not later than the arrival of Nehemiah in 445, his first prophetic address 1^{2-5} falling about 485, and the last 3^{22-24} in the period between 457 and 445. He was a faithful disciple of Ezekiel, influenced in his vocabulary by Deuteronomy, but betraying much less affinity with P. His characteristic dialogue style is remotely anticipated in Am 7^{1-9}. His religion lacks the ethical stress of the pre-exilic prophets, and there is in it not a trace of Jeremiah's conception of religion as a communion of the individual heart with God. The standpoint of the prophecy is eschatological, and sin is that which hinders Jahweh's coming, whether it be the social irregularities of the people, or the cultic irregularities of the priests. Malachi has enriched Hebrew religious conceptions by the ideas of the Forerunner of the Divine Parousia and of the Book of Destiny. These are but a few fragments of a book full of interest and information, which whets our appetite for the promised Commentary.

A second volume of Luther's sermons, containing those preached between 16th October 1530 and 14th April 1532, has just been issued.[2] As the first volume has already been noticed in these pages, suffice it to say that this fresh collection furnishes another demonstration of the almost inexhaustible fertility of Luther's mind, and of the ease and skill with which, often in very homely ways, he drove home his truth. An admirably exhaustive bibliography attests the wide variety of the themes handled, directly or indirectly—the Church, the Devil, Marriage, Prayer, the Pope, etc.—while the numerous references under the item 'Luther,' besides illustrating the strongly personal strain of Luther's preaching, yield many an interesting glimpse into his mind.

A book dealing with the Schwabian Fathers[3]—Oetinger, Fricker, Philipp Matth. Hahn, Michael Hahn, and, most illustrious of all, Bengel—has been compiled by Johannes Herzog, who also contributes a valuable Introduction with brief biographies of those evangelically minded men who did so much to counteract the rationalism of the eighteenth century. The book consists of selections from their sermons, meditations, letters, and diaries, arranged under such captions as these—God, Christ, Conscience, Faith, Regeneration, Prayer, the Bible, the Church, the Last Things. Herzog rebuts the charge that these men were narrow by pointing to the breadth of their scholarship and scientific knowledge and to their philosophical power. Bengel in particular, whose motto was 'te totum applica ad textum, rem totam applica ad te,' knew how to combine philosophy and criticism with spiritual edification. The dominant thoughts of all those thinkers were the Cross, the Resurrection, and the Kingship of Christ; and these selections, designed as a household manual of devotion, have been chosen with relation to the spiritual needs of the present day, and with the aim of deepening the spiritual life. The book is a fine and easy introduction to a realm in which it would be well if the modern spirit were more at home.

It is well known that many traits of primitive religion are to be found in the religion of the Old Testament. Professor Bertholet has selected the conception known as *mana* and illustrated it very amply in a recent brochure.[4] He shows that a

[1] *Der Prophet Maleachi* (J. G. Krüger, Buchhandlung, Ritter-Strasse, Dorpat; Mk.12.50).

[2] *Predigten D. Martin Luthers*, bearbeitet von Georg Buchwald (Bertelsman, Gütersloh; Mk.18).

[3] *Weisheit im Staube* (Rainer Wunderlich Verlag, Tübingen; geh. Mk.3.50, geb. Mk.4.50).

[4] *Das Dynamistische im Alten Testament* (Mohr, Tübingen; Mk.1.50).

mysterious power was believed by the Hebrews to reside in the hair, nails, eye, hand, heart, kidneys, liver, blood, excrement, spittle, breath, the spoken and the written word, the name (hence the special significance of theophorous names), the corpse, garments (for example, mantle, shoe), ornaments, knots, the staff, the lance, instruments (for example, hammer), water, fire, stones, salt, meal, fruit, letters (for example, the alphabetic psalms), numbers (cf. the 'sin' of David's census). This mysterious power, which reaches its zenith in the characteristic Semitic conception of God as *El*, can operate in dangerous and even deadly ways. Many ancient customs and laws can only be explained in the light of this conception.

The problem of Hosea's marriage has fascinated generations of scholars and not least those of the last generation. The discussion has been distinctly advanced by the contribution of Adolf Allwohn,[1] who applies the methods of the new psychology to the investigation. Respecting the traditional text and order of chs. 1–3 more than most of his predecessors, he prefaces the psychological discussion with a detailed exegesis of these chapters and with a criticism of the previous solutions of the problem of the prophet's marriage. He finds the key to the problem in the remarkable prominence of sexual interests which characterizes not only the first three chapters but more or less the whole book. This, he thinks, points to the fact that Hosea, unlike Amos, had a strongly sensuous nature. He understood and doubtless felt the fascination of the licentious Baal worship, but this sexuality was driven by the more powerful impulse of an austere Jahwism into the prophet's subconsciousness, where it lay ready as material for the ecstatic experience all too briefly described in 1^2. This adequately explains his call to marry a harlot—a call in which both impulses of his nature received their satisfaction. He lived, as Allwohn says, in both worlds: he felt the pull of the sensuous Baalism, but it was subordinated to the more overmastering pull of Jahwism. There was a genuine cleavage in his nature, with one part of which he loved Gomer, while with the other he resented her. In time, however, the sensuous impulse was sublimated, moralized, ennobled, and resentment gave place to forgiveness and altruistic (as opposed to egoistic) love. Thus with his own experience grew his apprehension of Jahweh as a God of love. This is an extremely interesting and valuable discussion, which will appeal to psychologists no less than to students of the Old Testament.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

The Apologetic Seminar at Wernigerode, Saxony, issues from time to time selected addresses or lectures under the editorship of Professor Carl Stange, and Nos. 15 and 16 of the series lie before us. In No. 15,[2] Professor R. Hermann ransacks certain early lectures of Luther for the purpose of setting forth the Reformer's conviction of the necessary connexion between justification and prayer, and discusses the significance of prayer in relation to the following: (i) justification as effected in man by God; (ii) the meaning and idea of repentance; and (iii) the righteousness of the new life. He expounds Luther's view as implying that, while justification will as a matter of course be attended throughout by prayer, yet, without taking account of prayer, we cannot truly say what justification is, and just as little what it is to be a sinner, and what it is to be justified. A useful summary closes the booklet.

No. 16[3] consists of four lectures delivered by Baron von Weizsäcker, a medical specialist, to an audience of clergymen. After recalling the close connexion between religion and healing in the Apostolic days, the lecturer sees in the occasion of these lectures a token of a new rapprochement. He is even willing to accord the primacy to the religious factor, but as the natural precedes the spiritual, he confines himself largely to the treatment of the soul on the biological and phenomenal side, and uses his experience as a physician to indicate lines of treatment for those who have spiritual ends in view. He specially stresses the personal link in all endeavours to influence disposition and character, and while he deals adequately with the organic link (kinship) and the more official link (*e.g.* in education), he gives due place to the soul's relationship to the spiritual element. If the author's results are not startling, the method of developing them is decidedly fresh and stimulating.

ALEXANDER GRIEVE.

Glasgow.

---

[1] *Die Ehe des Propheten Hosea in Psychoanalytischer Beleuchtung* (Töpelmann, Giessen; Mk.4).

[2] *Das Verhältnis von Rechtfertigung und Gebet*, nach Luthers Auslegung von Röm 3, von Professor Rudolf Hermann, Breslau (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; M.1.50).

[3] *Seelenbehandlung und Seelenführung*, nach ihren biologischen und metaphysischen Grundlagen betrachtet, von Frh. v. Weizsäcker (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; M.2).

The editors of 'Arbeiten zur Kirchensgeschichte' have sponsored Hugo Koch's *Cyprianische Untersuchungen*,[1] and in gratitude he dedicates it to one of them, Karl Holl, on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday.

The editors did well. We have here a book which embodies the results of a most patient and fruitful study of the writings and the times of the great African Bishop. There are twelve papers, with copious notes and a very full index.

Several of the studies are scarcely likely to arouse any considerable general interest, being only very laborious literary criticisms of what are not very important documents. Yet scholarship is surely not utilitarian; and the author is well content to have reached, at whatever expenditure of time and study, a grain or two of sober truth in the chronology of early Christian literature. Even such studies yield something beyond a bare date. They cast light on the development of the wonderful mind of Cyprian, and afford material for a study of the way in which his thought developed.

Of great interest and value to students of Christian doctrine will be the long and very scholarly paper on 'Die Bussfrage bei Cyprian.' It contains a careful examination not only of Cyprian's views, but of those of Novatian and the Roman leaders as well. It will appear that many have attributed views to Novatian which he certainly did not hold, and that the supposed sharp conflict between the views of Cyprian and those of Rome never existed. Difference there was, but nothing more than this, that Rome was always one step ahead of Carthage in a policy of mildness towards the *lapsi*.

Most interesting are papers vii. and viii. In the former, 'Cyprian und Seneca,' it is shown how the Church, protesting as it ever was against the vain philosophies of men, was most intimately related, in men like Cyprian, to the Stoic creed. The latter, 'Cyprian und Apuleius,' is still more striking. By comparing the vocabulary and phraseology of the Bishop with those of the cultured non-Christian, Koch proves to what an astonishing extent what we should call the technical terminology of Christian theology was common language in the schools of the Roman world. The difficulty, as the author indicates, is to discover what precisely the phrases meant to a non-Christian mind.

[1] Bonn: A. Marcus and E. Webers Verlag; RM.18.

The student of philosophy who wishes to have adequate knowledge of the system of Spinoza will, of course, have Joachim, and will do well to add the little but great work[2] by Professor Harald Höffding which has just come into our hands. As it is one of a series we presume that Höffding's amount of space was more or less prescribed; and within one hundred and forty-six pages he has performed a remarkable feat. Nothing important is neglected; proportion is kept; the treatment is necessarily very compact, but is crystal-clear in lucidity; and a valuable addition is made to the literature on Spinoza—that most intriguing of all figures in the history of philosophy. In an introductory chapter, which we wish had been longer, Höffding confines himself to an investigation of the *Gedankenmotive* of Spinoza. He finds three—the Jewish theology in which he was brought up; the Western science and culture which he studied with avidity after the breach with the synagogue; and very important, a certain impulse within himself, partly religious, partly intellectual, to arrive at understanding of himself and of his place in the great Whole.

What was Spinoza in religion? Because he rejected a personal God some called him atheist, and many more pantheist. Some few have tried to claim him for theism. 'The line,' says our author, 'between theism and pantheism is not easy to draw.' 'The thought of Spinoza is of such individual peculiarity, that it is not easy to classify it; it can really be best described just as Spinozism.'

W. D. Niven.

Aberdeen.

[2] *Bibliotheca Spinozana Curis Societatis Spinozanae*, Tomus iv.: *Spinozas Ethica, Analyse und Charakteristik* (Heidelberg: Winters; 7s. net).

Contributions and Comments.

The Reduction of Gideon's Army.

With reference to the paragraph on the reduction of Gideon's army, pp. 263–264 of the 1923 edition of Dr. Peake's Commentary on the Bible, may I suggest an explanation, drawn from actual and recent experience of warfare in Palestine, for the Divine order that those who lapped water, putting their hand to their mouth, should be chosen to save Israel?

My friend Colonel T. E. Lawrence told me in October 1918 that when engaged in the dramatic forced march with Arab troops through waterless country beyond Jordan, from the neighbourhood of Maan to near Deraa, where he cut the Turkish railway just before Allenby's September offensive, his people had to go for three days on the water they had in their water-skins. On arriving at a water-hole with the full summer thirst on them (September is still very hot in Palestine) they rushed to it—the experienced fighting-men, well versed in campaigning, knelt and scooped the water up in their hands to drink—the young men and middle-aged recruits who knew little about local warfare put their faces into the water, and no less than sixty (I think the figure was) of them got leeches into their nasal passages and lost so much blood before they could get rid of the creatures that many of them had to be left behind as being of no further use for fighting for the time being. I have visited Ain Jalud—or Gideon's Pool—but cannot say for certain that there are leeches in it, but at any rate the drinking test, then as now, would show who was a careful campaigner, who knew enough about local conditions to avoid taking unnecessary risks and might therefore be trusted to play his part in a night attack.

Harry Pirie-Gordon.
Athenæum Club, London.

Tongues at Pentecost (Acts ii.).

Articulate speech is one of the faculties which separate man from the lower creations. It is conditioned by, among other things, the mental and emotional states. An educated man does not speak like an uneducated man, nor does an excited man speak like an unexcited man. Mild emotion may induce stammering in a person of proper speech; surprise, passion, may reduce speech to mere ejaculation. All speech, secular or religious, conforms to these conditions.

It is essential to note that 'Tongues' are described in the New Testament as the vocal expressions of individuals, or of groups of individuals, who are more or less caught up into a state of religious exaltation. Now religious exaltation, like secular exaltation, covers a broad field. It begins with a sense of being uplifted or *above oneself*; strengthens and passes on through ecstasy and frenzy to a state of complete trance. The poetry of Holy Scripture is a good example of exalted expression. Some of it is ecstatic. The ejaculations 'Amen,' 'Hallelujah,' 'Hosanna,' and the 'Tongues' at Pentecost are ecstatic. As examples of frenzied and trance-state expression there are the inarticulate ejaculations, moanings, and mutterings described by the Apostle Paul in 1 Co 12, 13, 14.

Paul's considered opinion of 'Tongues' as given in these chapters must control our interpretation of Ac 2. 1 Co was written some ten years before Acts, and it is as certain as anything in this life can be that Luke, perfervid disciple and historian, knew and approved his great Master's considered opinion, and that nothing he has written in Ac 2 disproves that opinion.

Paul classifies 'Tongues' according to their nature and their spiritual values. As to their Nature: they are disorderly even to Bedlam—'Will they not say that ye are mad?' Incoherent—unintelligible, so that an interpreter is required. The speakers do not always remember what they have said—they are in the trance state. 'Tongues' even may be Blasphemous (one instance only). As to their Spiritual Values: they may edify the speaker, but without an interpreter they are useless to the Church. To the heathen who witnessed similar manifestations in their own religions, they may possibly be a sign, but for preaching they are worthless—childish. *Five clear words of exhortation are worth ten thousand Tongues. 'If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but have not charity, I am become sounding brass, or a clanging cymbal.'*

Another factor to be taken into account in any study of Ac 2 is the spiritual atmosphere. The emotional effects of the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, the Appearances, and the Ascension of the Christ on those first disciples must have been tremendous. In obedience to His command, they tarried in Jerusalem. As they tarried, the formal atmosphere of the great religious city awoke to perfervid life with the arrivals of dense masses of Pentecostal pilgrims from many lands.

Pentecost was more to Jewry than a festival of Harvest. It was the anniversary of the giving, in earthquake, thunder and lightning, of the Law at Sinai, the keystone of Judaism. A census in the

reign of Nero gives some two and a half millions of Passover pilgrims. Pentecost was the more important festival, and occurring fifty days later, offered better weather for travelling, therefore it attracted on the average more pilgrims than the Passover. But let those Passover figures suffice. Introduce two and a half millions of British pilgrims into any one of our great cities and imagine the effects. But we are of the cold, unemotional North. The nearer the Equator, the more emotional the people, and most of the Jewish pilgrims on that Pentecost came from sub-tropical countries. For a fit parallel we must go to, say, Mecca or Benares in a time of high festival.

In such conditions, *when the day of Pentecost was being fulfilled*, they were altogether in one place (Ac 2^1).

The description of 'Tongues' begins in v.^{4}. Let it be carefully noted (1) that the verb here used for 'to speak' is *apophtheggesthai*, and not *lalein*, the common term. *Apophtheggesthai* in the Septuagint has a special usage for the oracular expressions of prophets true or false. In English, an apophthegm is a short, pithy, forceful expression. So the speech of the disciples, like that of the prophets, seems to have been short, pithy, forceful. (2) The text says, '*Other tongues*' . . . The Tongues were not the disciples' normal speech. (*N.B.*—The 'Unknown' before tongues in 1 Co is an interpolation of King James' translators: it is not in the Greek text.) (3) By the testimony of the devout pilgrims (ch. 7), the speech was praise speech—*of the wonderful works of God*. (4) From the accusation of the mockers (v.^{13}), and the defence of Peter (v.^{15}), the scene was disorderly. (5) From ch. 6, supported by Lk 34^{53}, the disciples were in a state of religious exaltation on the morning of Pentecost. (6) That in that day, as in certain parts of the world still, the voice of the oracle was popularly held to be the immediate voice of the Spirit or God praised.

'Now there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, from every nation under heaven. And when this sound (the sound of the first tongues) was heard, the multitude were confounded, because that every man heard them speaking in his own language (*dialekto*), and they were all amazed and marvelled, saying, Behold, are not all those which speak Galileans? And how hear we every man in his own language (*dialekto*) wherein we were born? . . . We do hear them speaking in our tongues (*glossais*) the mighty works of God.'

Let it be noted (1) that the first *dialekto* in this passage is narrative, and that the second *dialekto* and *glossais* are direct speech. (2) That *glossais* is explanatory of the second *dialekto*. (3) In Co 1, *glossais* (tongues) has a specific usage as meaning the vocal expressions of religious exaltation. So here. (4) The foreign pilgrims are devout men and quick to interpret the medley of sounds—mass manifestation of 'Tongues' must always be a medley, and this is a mass manifestation; the mockers see, not an exhibition of madness, as Paul suggests in the Corinthian Church, but an exhibition of drunkenness. (5) The foreign pilgrims are not confounded at the disciples speaking with Tongues, but at them speaking with *their* 'Tongues.'

The belief that 'Tongues' at Pentecost were foreign languages gifted by the Holy Spirit to the apostles and disciples for purposes of evangelization has long been abandoned, but no satisfactory interpretation has taken its place. The Church, like the foreign pilgrims, is still confounded. What, then, were those Tongues? In St. Luke's belief, as stated in the text, they were the praise expressions of the foreign pilgrims.

The text gives eighteen provinces and states as being represented by those pilgrims. How came their praise expressions on the lips of apostles and disciples? Briefly, by exaltation of soul consequent on the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Year in, year out, at the festivals apostles and disciples had seen pilgrims from those eighteen provinces and states, and had heard their ecstatic praise expressions. Marching bodies of exalted men cannot be kept dumb. They must shout or sing. Those vast hordes of pilgrims going up to Jerusalem shouted and sang. Every shipload, every caravan, had its pilgrim's chorus, so to speak, which it chanted by the way, especially when it came within sight of and entered into the Holy City—a word, a phrase, a brief sentence. An Asiatic procession may march for miles chanting but a single word. Recall the 'Hosanna' of the multitude who went before and behind when Christ mounted the ass at Bethphage. Recall the same praise word by the children in the Temple when Christ had cleansed it. Even the children of Jerusalem knew the praise expressions of the pilgrims.

The human mind never absolutely forgets. It disposes itself in two conditions—the conscious and the subconscious. In the conscious mind, memory operates at will. In the subconscious mind, the will to memory is lost, and the contents of the subconscious only manifest themselves in dreams, exalted moods, and fevers. 'Tongues' at Pentecost were in no sense a gift of languages. At first, they were the praise expressions of the ecstatic disciples; when the foreign pilgrims appeared, the ecstatic disciples changed over to the foreign praise expressions—these being recalled to the disciples by the sight of the foreign pilgrims.

In what then, it may be asked, did the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost consist? There can only be one answer. The Heaven-sent revela-

tion that He whom the disciples had known and loved as Jesus of Nazareth, crucified, risen, ascended, was none other than the Son of God, the Saviour of the World.

W. S. Thomson.

Edinburgh.

Who was Nathanael?

The suggestion of W. B. Y. Scott, in The Expository Times for November (1926), is rather ingenious. Though Nathanael has been traditionally identified with Bartholomew, it is not certain that he was the same apostle. But I think that the arguments of Westcott render it more probable than any other suggestion. In the first three Gospels Bartholomew is named next to and as the companion disciple of Philip, just as some of the other apostles are put next to the Apostle who brought them to Christ. Nathanael is only mentioned by John in chs. 1 and 21, and he does not once refer to Bartholomew, as the other evangelists do not refer to Nathanael. In the first chapter of St. John all the other disciples mentioned become apostles, and none is so highly commended as Nathanael, and in the last chapter all the other companions of Nathanael are apostles or disciples of Christ. The name Nathanael is Hebrew, and could well be used by a Jew of Palestine, as the Apostle John is by orthodox critics supposed to be. Bartholomew is an Aramaic name, and as our Lord Himself spoke Aramaic, and that language was often used in diplomacy in the East, and especially in Palestine, where Aramaic and Greek were spoken, it may well have been used by Matthew and by Peter or Cephas as the basis of the Gospel of St. Mark and of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. It is significant of the early interpretation of the name Nathanael that Jn 1^{48} is rendered in the commentary of Ephraem Syrus on the Diatessaron of Tatian: 'Behold a true Israelite scribe in whom is no guile.' Now R. H. Strachan explains the word Israelite here as follows: 'This is the only instance of the word "Israelite" in the Gospels. It has the particular significance suggested by the story of Jacob of one belonging to the Jewish race, with special reference to the privileges conferred by God on His people. . . . Its use (as distinct from "Jew" and "Hebrew") became closely associated with belief in the Messianic hope.' But I do not believe that there is textual basis other than mere conjecture for reading 'Israel' instead of 'Israelite,' and so for identifying Nathanael with James or Ἰάκωβος, the son of Alphæus. Nor can he be the same with Levi, the son of Alphæus, whom the Gospel of Peter specifies as one of the disciples who were present at the Sea of Tiberias, and so as probably one of the other two disciples that are not named by John. It is strange that the Greek manuscript D and some cursives, as well as the Diatessaron, read in Mk 2^{14} 'James' for 'Levi' as sitting at 'the receipt of custom' at Capernaum, which was probably his home. Chrysostom mentions a tradition that Matthew and James were tax-gatherers and sons of the same Alphæus, though Ephraem Syrus refers to Nathanael as a scribe or γραμματεύς, whose duty it was to copy and preserve the Mosaic Law. The rôle of publican and scribe in the New Testament was altogether different. Nathanael, then, was probably a devout Jewish scribe of the village of Cana, waiting for the hope of Israel, and Matthew and James may have been despised publicans of Capernaum. It is noteworthy that Matthew, Mark, and Luke use Aramaic patronymic names such as Bartholomew, Bartimæus, and Barjonah, which we do not find in the Gospel of St. John, who, as a Jew of Palestine and then a Greek Jew of Ephesus, shows a preference for Hebrew and Greek such as Σίμων Ἰωάνου instead of Σίμων βαριωνᾶ, and Nathanael instead of Bartholomew. The conclusion is that Bartholomew and Nathanael offer the least objections to being identified among the Twelve as the same apostle, and that his name was Nathanael Bar-Talmai.

D. Browne.

Castlederg, Co. Tyrone.

Luke vii. 47.

In the August (1926) issue of The Expository Times the Archbishop of Dublin suggests that οὗ χάριν in Lk 7^{47} may carry a causal rather than a logical sense, and by some transposition of the text renders: 'I say unto thee, *because* her sins, which are many, are forgiven, verily she loved much.' On this point Papyrus Tebtunis, ii. 410, may be cited:

> Σωτηρίχω[ι] τῶι λαξῶι . . . [.] πρόσεχε χάριν οὗ παρορίζεται ὑπὸ γίτονος, κ.τ.λ.

Olsson, in his *Papyrusbriefe aus der frühesten Römerzeit* (p. 60), comments: χάριν οὗ: 'kausal, weil' (χάριν is here placed before its genitive in accordance with later Hellenistic usage). This would seem to lend support to the suggested causal sense of the phrase in Lk 7^{47}. Compare also 2 Mac 4^{16}, where the causal meaning of ὧν καὶ χάριν is at least as evident as the logical.

H. G. Meecham.

Oldham.

Entre Nous.

The Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.

We are glad to be able to announce that the Index Volume was published on the 26th of February (simultaneously here and in the U.S.A.). Besides the exhaustive Subject Index the volume contains indexes of Foreign Words and of Scripture Passages. There is also a complete List of Authors, with their contributions. In the Subject Index under general headings, such as 'Church History,' 'Ethics,' 'Philosophy,' 'Religion,' and 'Sects,' to name a few out of many, will be found grouped all related articles in their alphabetical order. This will enable those desirous of following out certain courses of study to find the material at a glance, and see their subject within the perspective of a vast yet minutely mapped field of research. The Index in this way will suggest lines of study as well as enormously increase the value of the Encyclopædia as a work of reference by making its contents easily accessible.

Dora Greenwell.

Dora Greenwell has always held her cherished place in the hearts of the elect. Among the ranks of her devoted admirers are such names as Whittier, the poet; Dr. John Brown, the genial author of 'Rab and his Friends'; Sir W. Robertson Nicoll; and Mr. Taylor Innes, the great ecclesiastical lawyer. But not even their eulogies have prevailed to maintain the number of her readers, and in consequence her books have gone out of print.

Is a resurrection possible? It is devoutly to be wished for, and would certainly be most timely. For the message of Dora Greenwell, and her whole attitude to life, are fitted to appeal to the present age more powerfully than to her own.

What was that attitude? It consisted essentially in her clear perception and intense realization of the eternal conflict between what Matthew Arnold called the Greek and the Hebrew spirit. She was at times tormented and torn asunder by the antagonism. 'She had two loves that pervaded her whole being; the one was Human Nature, and the other was the Cross of Christ.' On the one hand she was Greek to the core, and had infinite delight in all the beauties of Nature and of Art. In such a mood the Cross seemed stark and terrible. 'I know not,' she said, 'how to express clearly what I mean, but I do feel, sometimes painfully, a contradiction between the brokenness of Christ and the clear perfection of Art. . . . The very shape and outline of the Cross is suggestive of anguish, for, while it imitates the form of man, it contradicts his two strongest instincts, the desire for action and the yearning for rest. There man stretches out his arms, but to meet no kind of reciprocating pressure; there his feet are made fast as in the stocks, and the iron enters into his soul.' Why should that repellent form be thrust upon us, and that awful cry of desolation ring through the merriment at life's feast? Yet, by some heavenly spell, the Cross fascinates and draws irresistibly. 'Through every writing of Dora Greenwell the ideal is held up of the human soul becoming attuned to the keynote of Heaven, and so finding itself out of harmony with the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and dulcimer of this world.'

The solution of this antagonism which she reached was practical rather than speculative, and consisted in an attitude of utter loyalty to the Crucified. 'The death of the Saviour remains for me just what it is, a fact; the one great fact; in itself doubtless an enigma—Heaven's unexplained enigma—but the one which alone to my heart meets and touches all life's direst needs. It is more real than anything else in the world, or out of it; that which brings the pitying, sympathizing element into the whirl and awful chaos of creation; it makes of God a Being to be loved, because it proves that there is a necessity (of nature unknown to us) for the loss, anguish, and death that presses on the whole world, *and that God Himself has stooped to it.* How different from the old gods of Greece, careless and cruel in their continual serenity —*a God upon a Cross.* . . . I feel only that the Cross consoles, as Love itself consoles, by the mere presence of its sympathy. It is man's desolation met by the desolation of God. The words that were spoken from it, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me," echo but do not mock the cry exceeding loud, and bitter as was that of Esau, which earth sends up from its thousands of wrecked lives and sorrowful broken hearts.'

Miss Constance L. Maynard, who has already edited two volumes of Dora Greenwell's poems, has added to her good work by the issue of two more volumes. The first is a new edition of *Two Friends* (Allenson; 3s. 6d. net), with an introduction which will greatly aid the reader in making his way through that exceeding rich, but somewhat tangled, wilderness of religious discussion. He who makes the venture will gather rare fruit. The second volume is a new biography, *Dora Greenwell* (Allenson; 7s. 6d. net). Into it Miss Maynard has gathered a considerable amount of new material

from unpublished letters and her own assiduous research. She has added, what is undoubtedly the most valuable half of the book, an exposition and critical estimate of the teaching of Dora Greenwell. If these books meet with the reception they deserve, Miss Maynard will have rendered a notable service to the Christian Church.

Humility.

There came a time in the ministry of the late Rev. J. P. Struthers when he decided to read his sermons instead of preaching extempore. 'I thought it would do both me and my people good.' The sermons, which have been published with the title *Windows in Heaven* (James Clarke; 5s. net), all belong to this period, and are given exactly as they were written and delivered. Those who love Struthers of Greenock will be glad to have the volume. The sainthood of the man speaks here as elsewhere, though in his humility we can imagine how he would have spurned the term. Perhaps humility was a grace which flourished more in the last generation. This is what he says when addressing a minister at an induction service. 'I have more need to give a charge to myself than to give one to you. Let me tell you a few of the mistakes I have committed since I entered on the ministry.

'The first visitor who came to my manse was a drunk man. My first feeling, as he sat down and proceeded on what seemed his aimless talk, was one of annoyance. As he went on, his words and manner became somewhat alarming, and my great anxiety was to get rid of him. I advised him to go home to his wife and children, quite willing that they should bear for many hours, for I suppose the hundredth time, a burden from touching which with my little finger I shrank. I tried and, as I thought, succeeded cleverly in getting him out of my room. . . . "I am an old man," said he, "and you are a young man; and I have one advice to give you—Don't in future be quite so ready to show people to the door."'

Another experience he gives is of a young man, barely twenty. 'He was one of my people, but he neither attended Bible Class nor Prayer Meeting, nor was he always in church on the Sabbath Day; and I thought he did not care for me. But he sent for me when he was dying. . . . After he was dead, when I was trying to comfort his mother—and I bless God that she is still my friend, but I marvel at the grace—she said words to me that I trust no mother will ever say to you: "I sometimes thought that if you had taken a little more notice of Jamie, things might have been different."'

SOME TEXTS.

Heb 7[25].

'There is a bonnie story, I suppose a legend, that when in the first days of the struggle the British troops were landing in France and swinging through the streets cheering and shouting "Hip, hurrah!" the children, to whose ears tales of disaster and retreat were blowing from the Front, bravely translated the coming of their allies and their alien shout into a very comfortable promise, "*Il pourra!* he is able! he will manage! he will pull it off!" they cried about the streets, and laughed at fear. That is the very spirit of the Testament. "He is able," they keep saying happily, is surely able to meet every call upon us, and went on to meet them unafraid.'[1]

Ps 103[13].

'Years ago as a boy I heard George Adam Smith preaching in Edinburgh. The sermon has all flown, save this one illustration. He told us how a trawler had put out from Aberdeen, and in wild weather a tremendous sea swept away the skipper's laddie from before his very eyes. And in that dreadful moment, when for an agonizing second he saw his boy's arms stretched out appealingly to him who could do nothing, ere the white snarl of boiling waters dragged him down, I understood, he said, for the first time the meaning of a verse that I had known from childhood, "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him."'[2]

Luke 16[18].

'Some people find in this request an indication of some good in the rich man; I fail to see it. All I can see in this is the utter depravity of the rich man's nature. He who failed to relieve the hunger and suffering of his fellow-creatures, when he could have done it with the greatest of ease, now asks this man to go back into life, which was so unkind to him, that he might save his brothers from the just reward due to them if they were living such a life as he had lived.'[3]

[1] A. J. Gossip, *The Galilean Accent*, 217.
[2] *Ibid.*, 142.
[3] N. Levison, *The Parables: Their Background and Local Setting*, 177.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Among educated men the old controversy between Religion and Science will never again be waged, we may be sure, as it was waged during the latter half of last century. Then it was made to turn largely round the early chapters of Genesis: all the recent literature of that controversy shows how far we have moved from that restricted standpoint. The controversy itself is as keen as ever, but it is conducted in a much friendlier spirit, thanks, on the one hand, to a truer appreciation of the nature and limitations of science, and, on the other, to a better understanding of the nature of religion and the function of the Bible. Indeed, there are not a few thinkers, like Professors J. Arthur Thomson and J. Y. Simpson, who are prepared to recognize to the full the claims of each, and who are presenting us with a view of the world in which the controversy tends to disappear.

All the same, we have not done with Genesis yet. The work of the scholars, who are able to examine its early chapters in the light of comparative religion and more particularly of Babylonian religion, has served to throw into greater relief the wonder of the old Hebrew story, and to make it still possible for men who are the very reverse of obscurantist in their outlook to speak of 'revelation.'

As a contribution to a satisfactory interpretation of the early chapters of Genesis, which is just alike to the primitive nature of their mythical material and to the extraordinary ethical and religious insight with which that material has been manipulated, the recently published book of Mr. A. Gordon James entitled *The Creation Stories of Genesis and their Relation to Modern Thought* stands very high (S.C.M.; 4s. net). Mr. James is fully acquainted with the work of the scholars, but his chief interest in the stories is patently as inspired interpretations of the meaning of human life. And that is as it should be: for the Bible is literature, and, like all great literature, its supreme interest for us is as a criticism of life.

Mr. James is frankly modern. His appreciation of the Genesis stories does not lead him to see in them more than is there. He reminds us that they are pre-historic, pre-scientific, and pre-Christian, and that therefore it is illogical to resort to them for history or modern science or mature Christian doctrine. And he has no more doubt of the general truth of the evolutionary hypothesis than he has the desire to force those ancient narratives into conformity with that hypothesis. 'So vast is the evidence that has now been accumulated, representing researches stretching over a long period of years, that the existence of an evolutionary principle in the universe can only be denied by those who refuse to consider the facts or to exercise an impartial judgment upon them.'

Yet these immortal narratives stand alone in ancient literature in their power to penetrate and

interpret the secret of human life. And they do this all the more surely because they are essentially poetry rather than history. The ideas they embody are germinal, they are charged with an almost infinite suggestiveness, and the form in which they are clothed is ideally suited for the purpose of bringing them home to the universal mind. Or, as the writer puts it, 'One may take leave to doubt whether any form of artistic expression could have been employed for the successful transmission of ideas so germinal, so prolific and so expansive, more fitting than that used by the Genesis writers.'

Mr. James has also the candour and the courage to maintain that the Book of Genesis furnishes no warrant for the idea of Original Sin, which holds that man is liable to punishment for sins he never committed and may never commit; or for the idea of Universal Depravity, which brings all men under condemnation, even before they have any knowledge of what sin is. Of the Pauline belief that the sin of one involved the death of all 'there is no trace in the whole of the Eden narrative.' Our Lord's words about the little children, who embody the spirit which is the condition of entrance into the kingdom of heaven, show that 'to speak of infants as though they were little sinners is to run counter to the teaching of Christ.'

The true significance of the story of the 'Fall' is psychological, not historical. Though clothed in a quasi-historical garb and set among the narratives of 'beginnings,' it is essentially an analysis of life as we know it—especially of temptation and sin. Essentially it is the story not of an individual named Adam who stood at the beginning of history, but of *adam*, that is, of man, of humanity, of every man. It is in reality a sermon, in the form of a picturesque narrative, written round the words of Jeremiah (17^9), 'The heart is deceitful above all things, and it is desperately sick: who can know it?' It was written by a man who, like Jeremiah, knew his own heart, and who, knowing his own, knows ours: that is why he 'finds' us.

The speaking serpent (like the speaking ass in the Balaam story), the magic trees of knowledge and of life which only grow, as one critic has said, in the garden of religious imagination, are sufficient to warn all but the most hopeless obscurantists that, whatever else the narrative may be, it is not a narrative of historical fact. It is in other directions that we must look for the truth which it enshrines. Its truth is not the truth of ancient history, but the truth of universal experience: every man who has ever been tempted and fallen knows that the story is true and has sorrowfully to confess its searching power. As he reads, he hears a Voice saying to his inmost soul, 'Thou art the man.'

Where, within so small a compass, are we to look for a more searching analysis of sin? The tree was (1) good for food, (2) a delight to the eyes, (3) desirable to make one wise: here is temptation coming in the form of a sensuous impulse, an æsthetic enjoyment, an intellectual ambition. All these things are right and proper in their own place, at their own time, and when under the control of reason and conscience. But, as Mr. James very truly says, 'Sin never gives the right kind of knowledge in the right way.'

Thus it comes about that man has lost his Paradise by his own folly. In man's natural environment there are factors that are not evil of themselves, but that, if wrongly used, will lead to his undoing. From the religious point of view, he fell through disobedience to the inner voice, through moving along the line of inclination and appetite in preference to that of reason and conscience; from the scientific point of view, he fell through failing to adapt himself to his environment. Sin is in either case a missing of the mark: it is the deliberate choice of the lower in the presence of the higher, and it is the failure to progress along the true line of development. And thus this ancient story, for all its mythical investiture, is in its inmost spirit and at its deepest depths true to the teaching of modern science.

Everywhere, as Mr. James reminds us, man has recognized that there is something wrong, not only with the world, but also with himself. The root

of the matter is in man himself. This ancient Hebrew interpreter of life traces the evil and difficult things in the world back to man's perverted will. He believes that God is good, that man was meant for Paradise; but nothing is more certain than that he is not there now, and for that he has himself to blame. He disobeyed the reasonable Voice, he chose the baser way, and so he was cast—or rather he cast himself—out of the lovely garden.

There are points in the argument at which we may differ from Mr. JAMES. As, for example, when he says: 'There is no reason to suppose that man will not find a way to control the earthquake even as he has learned to master fire.' Living as we are in an age when man's control of the forces of Nature can be described as nothing less than wonderful, we may yet take leave to doubt whether it will ever come to that. Or, again, when he says: 'God is and must ever be a Probability.' What would Thomas à Kempis, or Augustine, or Paul, or any of the Biblical writers, have said to that? These men at any rate, and countless others, *knew* in whom they had believed. But for the general drift of Mr. JAMES's argument and its power to attract and convince the modern mind, we have nothing but commendation.

In view of the criticisms and challenges to which the teaching of the Bible has been and is being subjected, it is refreshing to meet a thoroughly modern, unprejudiced, scientific thinker who can yet honestly confess his faith in a special revelation. These are Mr. JAMES's words: 'The extraordinary manner in which the Eden story contains ideas that are not found in contemporary literature of a similar character suggests the possibility of a special revelation given to selected persons for a special purpose. If those ideas are found to be re-echoed by the patient, scientific investigator, working on quite different lines, and with a different purpose in view, we may begin to suspect that here, too, is revelation, though of a different kind.'

Our generation has seen a new interest arising in Jewish apocalyptic and the provision of abundant material for the enrichment of our knowledge of the subject and of its influence on the Christian hope. In *The Economic Background of the Gospels* (Milford; 7s. 6d. net), the Rev. Frederick C. GRANT, D.D., has set himself to account psychologically for the forms taken by the apocalyptic expectation.

In times of acute political distress, why did Jewish seers place in the forefront of their vision Divine intervention and chastisement of their enemies? How can we account for the apocalyptic conception, adopted by Jesus, of life in the world to come as a banquet, a Messianic feast in which the hungry are filled and the disheartened comforted? Why did even the more spiritual of the apocalyptists, those who knew that their hope was laid up in heaven, retain the crude symbolism of a politico-economic dream?

Our knowledge of psychology would lead us to expect to find the answers to these questions in repressed desires. Even those who are far from being experts in the subject can suggest facts that go far to explain apocalyptic imagery. The kingdom of God on earth remained for the Jew an unrealized ideal; and apparently the longer the coming of the kingdom was delayed, the more vividly were the kingdom and the consequences of its coming realized. Moreover, combined social, moral, and political ineffectiveness paved the way for the conviction that, since men were powerless to help, the kingdom could be realized only through the direct intervention of God.

We are learning to read the Gospels and the teaching of Jesus in the light of the political situation. What Simkhovitch and others have done for our understanding of the political context of the gospel story, Dr. GRANT has now done for its economic context. The thesis of his book is that the pessimism which gave rise to apocalyptic hopes was inspired largely by economic conditions; by over-population, especially in the cities, by a declining productivity in the soil beyond human

ingenuity to circumvent, and by oppressive taxation, civil and religious.

In the first place, there is reason to think that the population of Palestine had grown up to, if not beyond, the limits of subsistence. Moreover, this prolific race was in large measure deprived of the remedies adopted for other overpopulated areas. The Jews were not a military people; and, if they had been, the Roman Empire stood in the way of their possible conquests. In some degree the *diaspora* provided the safety-valve of emigration; but there was a strong feeling against the emigration of native-born Jews; was not the land promised to Abraham and to his seed for ever? Moreover, there was always a counter-current of exiles returning to Palestine.

Add to this the necessity of providing for the large military establishments kept by the Romans in the country, and of finding food for pilgrims who annually came in their thousands to keep the sacred festivals, and it is easy to realize that at times the resources of the country were strained to the utmost.

In the time of our Lord, Palestine could hardly have been described as a land flowing with milk and honey; yet it was sufficiently well endowed by Nature to support a reasonably large population. There were enough and to spare of olives, vines, and figs; and there was an export trade in fish; but agricultural methods were crude, and, in any case, there was another factor at work tending to impoverish and depress the people, namely, taxation. What made taxation in Palestine so onerous was that there were two taxing authorities, the imperial and the ecclesiastical. Neither of these was under any obligation to take account, or did in fact take account, of the burdens imposed by the other.

It is true that the positive demands of the Romans were not in themselves excessive, especially after the reforms of Augustus. Yet the Romans needed, and insisted on getting, tribute for the support of the administration and for defence, for the upkeep of the style affected by the Italian gentry, and for free food to stave off a revolution of the Roman proletariat. The sting of the Roman taxation lay in the fact that it was paid to a Power that was not merely foreign but heathen; and that the system left not merely the collection but even the assessment of the taxes to unscrupulous tax-farmers and their agents. It was no wonder that Theudas and Joseph and others led riots 'at the time of the taxing.'

This imperial taxation was combined with the tax-system of the priestly theocracy, the proceeds of which went to Jerusalem to support the priestly hierarchy and the Temple worship. The growing power of the priesthood after the Exile was connected both as cause and as effect with the immeasurably great increase in the contributions which the priests levied on the people.

Of these taxes the best known is the tithe. The discussion of the detailed application of the law of the tithe is familiar to readers of the Gospels. But besides the tithe, pious Israelites recognized many other obligations of religious finance. There were, for example, the primitive taxes of the sin-offering, the thank-offering, and the shew-bread, the first-fruits of grain and certain fruits, the first-born of animals, redemption money for the first-born child, dues for release from vows, the annual half-shekel tax paid into the Temple treasury, and other more or less considerable imposts.

Besides all these, as the story of the widow's mites reminds us, Jews gave free-will offerings for the Temple, while there were further contributions for education, for charitable relief, and for the upkeep of the synagogues. There was also a tendency for taxes, originally alternatives, to be combined, for free-will offerings to be made compulsory, and for disputes to be settled in favour of the priests. Moreover, where the priesthood was hereditary and was not limited to the first-born son, there was no effective check to the number of priests who claimed support from the people.

The Jews *could* not resist the demands of Cæsar; they *would* not resist the claims of the priests; for

were not these the claims of God? Can we wonder that, driven at last to desperation, they took the road of armed rebellion which led to the destruction alike of their holy city and their Temple?

Mr. Middleton Murry's 'Life of Jesus' has led, as it was bound to do, to a somewhat acute controversy. Not all the reviews were as sympathetic as that published in this magazine, and Mr. Murry has adopted a somewhat truculent attitude on his side of the debate. Our review of the book was appreciative just because it was the honest attempt of a literary man to face up to the Fact of Christ. That is sufficient to arouse sympathy in any religious mind. And there is in the book so much genuine insight into the greatness of Jesus that it may be described without exaggeration as a profoundly religious book.

Widespread interest was therefore aroused when it was announced that Mr. Murry was going to talk to the world—or that large portion of it that listens to the 'wireless'—on 'The Religion of a Journalist.' That could only mean his own religion. And one naturally wondered whether we should get any more light on Mr. Murry's convictions, and more especially on his attitude to Jesus. Multitudes must have listened to the talk who do not listen in a church, for the simple reason that they are not there. There never was a time—at least Dr. Mott says so, and he should know—when interest in religion and on what it has to say for itself was so widespread in the world. And Mr. Murry had a great opportunity to say something helpful to the great numbers of people who are at present waiting for some encouragement to believe.

One hearer is free to confess that the 'talk' was a melancholy, almost a tragic, disappointment. Mr. Murry asked what religion is, and took the common description of it as belief in God. Well, but what can you really say about such a phrase? Can you define 'God'? Or can you define 'belief'? No, in both cases! Belief can only mean such a confidence in God as implies the giving of one's whole life to God or resting one's whole self on God. But does any one do that? No. Therefore there are practically no people who believe in God. The conclusion would naturally be that there is no such thing as religion, because we don't know what we mean by 'God,' and nobody really 'believes.' And in this sense of religion probably that was Mr. Murry's own conclusion.

But he had another idea of what religion is. His own religion is hero-worship. He did not mention what hero it is he worships. And in fact he suggested that it did not matter. This, however, was the right kind of religion and a sufficient one. And he left us there. It must, however, have occurred to many hearers to ask, 'But is there such a thing as worship?' Worship really means the giving up of our whole self to an object. It is very much the same thing as belief. But does *any one* do that? Does Mr. Murry? We suggest that his hero-worship is as imperfect and as partial as the 'belief' of many people which he sets aside.

If you are going to suggest that an attitude in religion must be perfect, and completely embodied in action, before it is real, then Mr. Murry's hero-worship must be swept aside as non-existent. Hero-worship must mean the complete and perfect surrender of ourselves in admiration and imitation of some ideal person. But there is nobody alive who worships in this ideal way an ideal person. Mr. Murry would be the last to claim anything like consistent perfection for himself. But if his worship is to be as real as he demands that 'belief' should be, then it must be perfect and continuous, 'which is absurd.' The address was a quaint example of superficial and inconsequent thinking.

Hark back for a moment to the definition of religion as 'belief in God.' Because we cannot exhaust the significance of this word 'God,' because we cannot fully comprehend Him, does that mean that we do not know anything of Him? Or enough to justify our worship and trust? There are many millions of people (there always have been) who know what they mean when they say

'God.' They believe in a Heavenly Father who cares for each one of us, who is able to help us, and who is behind Nature, history, and life. They may be wrong, or they may be right, but at any rate they 'know in whom they have trusted.'

And about believing. Is it really the case that, unless we give ourselves up wholly and always and consistently to God's will, we do not really believe? That means that we must instantaneously be consistent and perfect in our life or we cannot be said to be believers. But it is matter of common experience that people are made better through their belief, that belief opens the way to the Divine grace. And it is equally matter of common experience that people believe in God who yet are not always able to translate their belief into practice. Mr. MURRY demands an intensity and power of belief which are only likely to be seen in heaven before he admits that any one has a religion of this kind; while, strangely enough, he does not apply the same exacting standard to hero-worship.

It was rather tragic to think of so many people listening to this kind of thing who really needed, and in many cases desired, some 'guidance in matters of faith' of a positive kind. Of course, hero-worship is not religion at all except in the widest and thinnest sense of religion. We may admire many things and many people, and our admiration may do us any amount of good. 'We live by admiration,' as well as by other things. But admiration (even of Jesus) does not constitute religion. It does not have any necessary connexion with the Unseen and Eternal, with the Creator of the Universe, or with the Source of the Good, the Beautiful, and the True. If religion has nothing to say to us about these high matters, it will leave unsatisfied the deepest cravings of the soul.

The doctrine of Christian Perfection has not received from systematic theologians the attention which its importance warrants. Dr. PLATT, who has treated the subject in the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS, writes: 'The subject, strange to say, is a bypath in Christian theological systems, and one has to wander in search in many ways. But with time and patience much may be gathered; and a good modern treatise on the subject is needed, and would be valuable.' This blank has now, in large measure, been filled by a very excellent work on *The Doctrine of Christian or Evangelical Perfection*, by the Rev. H. W. PERKINS, D.D. (Epworth Press; 8s. 6d. net).

Dr. PERKINS begins by defining Christian or evangelical Perfection as 'a spiritual state, mediated by the Holy Spirit, in which the believer in Christ has a full assurance of his redemption through the blood of Christ, and enjoys unbroken communion with the love of God.' After some explanatory comments on this definition, he proceeds to a very careful and elaborate study of Biblical teaching on the subject. The terminology of both the Old and the New Testament is analysed in detail, and the doctrines of the perfection of Christ and the perfecting of believers and of the Church are fully elucidated. The point is emphasized that 'we are discussing, not the production of a perfect man, but union with the perfection of God.' This study of Biblical teaching raises a number of vital and interesting questions, such as these: 'Is the teaching of Perfection an essential part of the Gospel as proclaimed by Christ and His apostles? Can we find a better term, one less liable to misunderstanding, than Perfection? Ought we to describe the state indicated by that term as sinless? Is it possible in this life? Will the future life include probation or purgation for those who have not attained perfection in this?'

Before dealing with these questions, however, Dr. PERKINS enters on an elaborate historical survey. After dealing with 'influences outside Christianity which have affected the conception of evangelical Perfection,' he goes on to outline the history of the doctrine in the early Church, dealing at some length with Clement and Origen, Ambrose and Augustine. Coming to mediæval and modern times, he very happily treats his subject under three heads: '(*a*) the idea of attainment under the sanction of the Church, (*b*) the idea of attainment through

obedience to the Word, (*c*) the idea of attainment through the witness of the Spirit.' These three modes are exemplified in (*a*) Monasticism and the Catholic Mystics, (*b*) Wesley and the Methodists, (*c*) The Quaker Movement.

The historical survey having revealed 'the wide extent of the quest for Perfection and the inalienable place of the quest in the Christian Gospel,' the writer proceeds to a modern formulation of the doctrine. He finds it to be 'a present experience through faith and hope, to be consummated in eternity.' Dr. Forsyth is quoted with approval as saying that there are three ways by which men have sought to arrive at the goal, of which two are wrong and the third is right; but that all three are right compared with the notion that we are to wait for Perfection 'till some indefinite time in the indefinite future.' The objections raised against the term and its misuse are clearly recognized. 'Yet, when we consider the abundant use of the word in the New Testament, and the fact that the idea runs through the whole of it, we are not prepared to acquiesce in the suppression of the term. . . . And, after all, what better translation than "perfect" can be found? "Entirely sanctified" has been put forward as a synonym. It appears, however, quite as objectionable, so far as any claim to holiness is concerned, and it does not bring out the idea of *teleios*. . . . What the mature Christian is seeking for is some term which shall bear witness to the fact that he is assured that he has passed out of his nonage, and that he has arrived at a stage of firm confidence that the divine purposes of love will be fulfilled in him, and through him to the blessing of many others.'

An interesting section deals with the preaching of the doctrine, and the general conclusion is reached that 'the doctrine of Perfection ought to take its place among those which in their union constitute the full Evangel. Its neglect has been one of the main causes of weakness and failure. This was clearly foreseen by the apostles, and stated by them with uncompromising plainness. Failure to reach maturity in the spiritual life has often been due to the absence of instruction and culture; and this failure has been the disastrous result of bringing in the idea of a double morality, which is a foreign intrusion, into the gospel message. The true doctrine speaks of a natural and normal development which all Christians ought to expect and pray for. Where this is not taught by those who are leaders in the Church, the soul experiences a sense of disappointment, which may induce it to turn to those who will lead it astray. Foolish and hurtful notions of Perfection spring up in the soil where the wholesome teaching of the full Gospel has been omitted. The Church ought earnestly to strive to formulate a message in which the state of Perfection shall be set forth as the definite aim of all who have entered on the Christian way.'

The Parables of the Treasure and the Pearl.

By Professor W. P. Paterson, D.D., Edinburgh.

II.

The Challenge of the Parables.

The business of the preacher is to persuade, and our Parables had the force of an argument by which Jesus sought to procure or to confirm a momentous decision. He called men to enter upon and to persevere in a life of privation and danger, and the argument which He was accustomed to employ was that which best commends a painful and hazardous enterprise—namely, that the sacrifices were justified by the greatness of the expectations. It was used for the persuasion of the rich young ruler who, when he was bidden to sell what he had and give to the poor, was promised that he would thus have treasure in heaven (Mt 19^{21}). It also served for the confirmation of the disciples

who had already obeyed the call, as when He said that 'every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life' (Mt 19^{29}). And what was thus taught in the plain way was repeated in the picturesque way by giving instances of two men who found a rich prize within their grasp, and who secured it by way of a profitable exchange. The themes of the Parables are thus the supreme value of the Kingdom and the great renunciation which it requires, and these, as has been said, are a challenge to modern Christendom, since it is a question whether it really believes the first and really practises the second.

1. *The Kingdom as the Highest Good.*—The truth which is the foundation of the appeal for sacrifice is the supreme value of the Kingdom. The finders of the treasure and the pearl came into possession of a fortune, and it was thus made to appear that the disciple of the Kingdom was one who rose from poverty to wealth, and that a wealth beyond compare. It was the same doctrine which was implied in the royal imperative—'Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness' (Mt 6^{33}), and again in the admonition which has haunted the Christian conscience as the most solemn of all warnings: 'What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?' (Mk $8^{36.\ 37}$). From other passages Biblical Theology compiles a list of the blessings which make up this incomparable wealth. The boon which is most prominent is everlasting life or the heavenly inheritance. But much was also said of privileges of the Kingdom which are experienced in the present world. The chief of these—if they may be described by the modern categories—are the religious values of the forgiveness of sins and filial communion with the heavenly Father; the moral values of the change of heart, the practice of the true righteousness, and the call to the service of God and man; the intellectual values of the knowledge of the Father and of the mysteries of the Kingdom; the social values of the fellowship of the Christian society; and the affective values of the peace and the joy which the world can neither give nor take away. The Kingdom might even be said to include economic values, since the disciples were assured of a providential care by which the hairs of their head were all numbered, and were promised that if they made it their concern to seek the Kingdom of God the Father in heaven would make it His concern to provide for their earthly necessities (Mt 6^{33}).

The Church has been accustomed to proclaim these blessings as a great salvation, and has so valued them even when it has only seen them in part. In the Middle Ages salvation was often narrowed down to the eternal salvation; but it was then practically the universal theory—however inconsistent might be the practice—that the goods of this world are not worthy to be compared with the treasures of heaven. The evangelical schools fastened attention on the truth that even for this life the one thing needful is to repent and believe the gospel, and thereby to obtain deliverance from the guilt and the power of sin, with the accompaniments of peace of conscience and joy in the Holy Ghost. Within wide Protestant circles it has even been the popular opinion that the only true blessedness is to be in the state of salvation. As to the latter-day Protestant Church it cannot be said that the Christian salvation is usually rated as the most precious possession within the knowledge and the reach of man. There are not a few to whom judgment and eternity are solemnizing certainties, to whom conversion and sanctification are great realities, and who can sincerely profess that to them to live is Christ; but even these find it difficult to think of their religion as other than one pearl among many. The average view, no doubt, is that it is of some value. Most people think it worth their while to be members of a branch of the Christian Church, to join in its worship, and to do or give something in support of its spiritual and philanthropic enterprises; while the doctrines of Christianity have some influence upon their thinking, and its ethical principles are at least a factor in the determination of the details of their conduct. But it does not appear that their religion is more than a minor interest in comparison with their daily work, their home-life, and their recreations, and it would be absurd to affirm that they regard it as the most important of all their concerns. In so far as it is generally valued it is mainly for lesser reasons than are given in Theology—as that worship brings a sense of tranquillity by offering a temporary escape from worldly strife and anxieties, that ecclesiastical life provides rational and helpful forms of social intercourse, and not least that the influence of the Church is a useful supplement to that of the school and the home in the difficult work of building up the moral character of the young, and equipping them to withstand the assaults of the Devil and the flesh. And clearly this half-hearted belief in the value of Christianity is a very perilous declension. For faith in a chief good is one that human nature cannot do without; and if we do not find one in

our religion, we are likely to adopt that which is recommended by the inclinations of the natural man, and so to miss our way both to nobility of character and to habitual peace of mind.

It would therefore appear that nothing is more needed in our generation than a revival of faith in the Christian religion as supreme among values. Various attempts are as a fact being made to promote such a revival. The Roman Catholic Church has its propaganda in which the Church is magnified not merely as the protector against the menaces of eternity, but also as the refuge from the storm and the covert from the tempest that are so sorely needed in our chaotic and bewildered age. There have also been evangelical missions which have prepared for and supplicated the outpouring of the Holy Spirit which is at once man's greatest need and God's greatest gift. An earnest group has fastened on the promise of the Second Coming as the one sufficient hope for a world whose spiritual bankruptcy has become naked and open, and which is deemed to be ripe for judgment and on the brink of destruction. But perhaps the greatest service that has been done to revive a sense of the paramount value of Christianity has been rendered by Jesus Himself acting through the Biblical record of His preaching of the word in the days of His flesh. There are many to whom it has come as a new revelation when they have sat at the feet of Jesus Himself, pondered the message as He delivered it, and learned to understand and appreciate the work of the Saviour as the founding and the advancement of the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom of God is in truth a sublime idea which may well lay a spell on mind and conscience. Nothing higher can be proposed to the individual than that he should become righteous in heart and life after the pattern of the righteousness of the Kingdom, and that he should become the possessor of the privileges which are promised to the children of the Kingdom in time and eternity. The best that could be asked for the world is that it should become subject to the sovereignty of God, that its life should be purified and governed in every sphere by the principles of the Kingdom—which are purity and peace, justice and brotherly love, with filial piety—and that men everywhere should know the Father, and should work as well as pray that His Kingdom may come and His will be done in earth as it is in heaven. It may indeed be that this school exemplifies the law of history that the measures of man's mind are always narrower than the thoughts of God; and that, in the enthusiasm which they feel for the Kingdom as the splendid task to which they are called, less than justice is done by many of the disciples to the idea of the Kingdom as an unmerited salvation which is of the Lord. There is need in some quarters of the reminder that man does not live by ideals alone, but by the promises that proceed out of the mouth of God, and by the fulfilment of His promises. For without doubt it is an axiom of the Christian gospel that the condition of the coming of the Kingdom, whether in the life of the race or in individual experience, is that God Himself must take the initiative and bear the chief part of the burden —even as in our parables everything hinged on the providential strokes of good fortune that are a symbol of the God-given salvation and of the gifts of God by grace.

2. *The Demand for Sacrifice.*—The message of the sister Parables is that earthly goods ought to be willingly sacrificed for the sovereign good of the blessings of the Kingdom. The finders of the treasure and the pearl parted with all else that they might secure these; and Jesus applied the lesson to the young ruler when He bade him sell his possessions, and to others when He called upon them to leave their homes, and even to hate father and mother for His sake. The rule was even stated in unqualified terms—'whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple' (Lk 14^{33}). And sometimes it has been even as He said. The Twelve, as Peter said, forsook all that they might follow Him, and later on some of them, along with the confessors and martyrs of later days, were to follow Him to prison and to death. The demand was also literally fulfilled by such as Bernard of Clairvaux and Francis of Assisi, who renounced every good that the world prizes, and welcomed every evil that it fears, to the end that they might win Christ, and be found in Him, and do His works of teaching and of mercy. The life of the modern Protestant Church has moved on a different plane. The general experience of its members has rather supported the observation that godliness is profitable for this life. It has not even been made very hard for those who have succeeded the Twelve and the Seventy in the office of the Christian ministry. They could not, indeed, amass riches, but on the whole they have had the solid comforts of the middle station of life, together with Nature's chiefest blessing of home and wife and child. They have also enjoyed in an unusual degree the privilege of being allowed so to manage their lives as to leave a large place for self-development and culture, and when they have been found faithful in their vocation they have gained a larger

measure of popular esteem, and wielded a wider influence, than are readily obtained by equal talents and labours in any secular calling. And the question is, What is to be thought of this prosperous and comfortable Christianity in the light of the teaching of Jesus as to the imperious demand of the Kingdom for sacrifice?

The case for the defence may be briefly outlined. The first branch is the thesis that worldliness consists, not in possessing the goods of this world, but in valuing them as ends in themselves, or in using them for selfish or sordid ends; and that the renunciation of the world essentially consists in a detachment of spirit, and a devotion to higher ends, which is quite compatible with a life that is crowded with mundane interests and activities. It is from this point of view that Calvin, in the chapter of the *Institutes* on self-abnegation, pictures the Christian man as outwardly resembling the children of this world in the pursuit of this world's goods, while he differs from them in that his diligence in business is a matter of duty, his success is thankfully ascribed to the Divine blessing, and wealth and honours are held and used with a single eye to the glory of God and the service of man. Similarly it was the theory that when the minister is permitted a share of the natural blessings of life, it is that he may be the better equipped for the work of God and of His Church than would be the case if he were devoted to the loneliness of the celibate and burdened with the anxieties and the humiliations of the mendicant. The second branch of the apologia may be summed up under the heads that under modern conditions there is no longer occasion for the sacrifices of the heroic order, that credit has to be given for potential sacrifice, and that as a fact the Church evokes a very large measure of self-sacrificing service. In the first place, when the world ceased to despise or hate Christianity, and proceeded to take it under its patronage, the extreme forms of sacrifice naturally became an anachronism. Secondly, it is deemed just to take account of the large and important, if necessarily impalpable, volume of sacrifice which would be forthcoming if called for. It was one of the revelations of the Great War that a generation which seemed to have been brought up in the faith that pleasure is the chief good, and in the practice of self-indulgence, was nevertheless able and willing to respond to the call to risk and surrender everything that flesh holds dear; and it may be taken for granted that there is in the Church an immense reserve of the same spirit which is known to the Searcher of hearts, and which is appreciated by Him as the good will which has the worth of many good deeds. And finally, there is the impressive body of concrete sacrifices which are actually made by ministers and missionaries who give their lives to ill-supported and ill-recognized service in the waste and dismal places of their homeland and of distant parts of the earth, by faithful members who devote much unpaid time and labour to works of teaching and mercy, and by the general Christian body which makes contributions of money running to many millions in support of schemes such as Foreign Missions which men of the world think to be useless when they are not mischievous, but which the faithful support because they are dictated by the command, and are in accordance with the example, of Christ.

This apologia is certainly effective up to a certain point. And yet—the teaching of Jesus seems to demand more sacrifices of the literal kind than have been elicited in Protestantism by the theory of a worldly unworldliness, and also more than are represented by the offerings and the labours of the modern Church. It may be expected that in another age overt acts of renunciation will again be given a more prominent place in the life of the ministry, of the representative laity, and of the general membership of the Church. It may be that self-abnegation will be enforced from outside—that as the result of political and intellectual revolutions the world will develop a new hostility to Christianity, and will require many who profess the Christian faith to choose between apostasy and a persecution operating either by violence or by ridicule. In one way or another there is likely to be a more urgent call to transform the potential sacrificial energy of the body of Christ into concrete forms of life and deed. The task of the minister of the future is likely to become harder, and the work that is now done by two or more may have to be undertaken by one. It may also be expected—though this should not, perhaps, be said by one who has had the fullest benefit of the ideal of a comfortable ministry—that the ministerial vocation will take on a sterner character. Probably self-denial will be practised as a thing of course in the matter of the pleasures of wine and tobacco which have hitherto been thought lawful, there will be a greater detachment from worldly amusements which are merely an indulgence and a waste of time, and doubtless also there will be a more severe self-limitation in the devotion of time and opportunity to the ideals of intellectual and æsthetic culture. It may also happen that a special class of disciples will emerge who will revive a rigorist

standard of literal self-abnegation. From time to time the Church rediscovers that human nature as such, and still more regenerate human nature, can find a rare pleasure in the crucifixion of the lower self when an appeal is made by a great cause to the imagination, the heart, and the conscience; and there is no reason to be found among Protestant principles why it should not supplement the labours of the regular ministry by various orders of teachers and workers who would humble and impoverish themselves in the literal way that Jesus did, because sacrifice is the mother-tongue of love, as well as because the Cross is the surest way to the hearts of those that the disciple of Christ desires to serve. More also may be expected of the Church as a whole in the matter of practical and adequate self-denial. It may be that the great Protestant Churches will come to be sifted after the manner of Gideon's army, and will be greatly reduced in numbers, but if so this would doubtless be compensated for by a deepened sense of responsibility, and by a corresponding effort to make the offerings commensurate with their profession. The gifts of money and of service which are made by the membership of these Churches—large as they now are in the aggregate—bear but a small proportion to the expenditure made by the same persons on mere luxuries, and to the toils which they undertake in pursuit of pleasure; and it is certain that there would be a vast increase in the proportion of Christian giving if the Church were to realize afresh, with the coming of another spiritual spring, that it is indeed in possession of the great treasure and the unique and incomparable pearl.

Literature.

WHAT IS RELIGION?

Professor W. Morgan, D.D., of the Chair of Systematic Theology and Apologetics in Queen's Theological College, Kingston, Canada, has just written and published through Messrs. T. & T. Clark an exceedingly able book, *The Nature and Right of Religion* (10s.). Professor Morgan's career as a writer began, if we remember aright, in this magazine a number of years ago with two articles on the religious philosophy of Ritschl. The articles created a good deal of interest, because they were the most penetrating and knowledgeable interpretation of Ritschl that had appeared in English. Since those days Dr. Morgan has produced at least one considerable work on 'The Religion and Theology of Paul,' a book of immense ability which tended rather strongly to the radical wing of New Testament scholarship. Still, it was a good book and in many ways illuminating and helpful. The present volume is of a more general kind and might have been written for a Gifford lectureship. It shows one thing clearly, that Dr. Morgan has not departed very far from his ancient loyalty to Ritschl. The central position of this book is the supremacy of values. Dr. Morgan rather scorns the logical line of proof for religious truth, though he does not wholly deny its worth. He can proceed quite easily from value to existence, and the place of religion in the hierarchy of faith is determined by the nature of the values it represents. Our belief in God is rooted in our feeling for values, more particularly in our feeling for the ideal values. 'It is under the form of value that the Divine is apprehended; the Divine is that which approves itself to us as supreme in value.' Religious faith is trust in the rational, the beautiful, and, above all, the good, as the ultimate reality in the universe.

Similarly, in dealing with what Christianity (the highest religion) really is, Dr. Morgan says: 'In determining the essence of any religion we are therefore thrown back on the character of the values it affirms. . . . Christian faith or piety receives its character from the Christian values; and our task therefore resolves itself into one of describing what these values are.' Christianity is a much simpler thing than the Church has been willing to believe. 'It is nothing else than trust in the great values for which Jesus stands as that which gives to our human life its meaning and glory, and as the ultimate reality in the universe.' As to the position of Jesus in religion that is secured (as Herrmann said) by this, that, if He is not the only fact in the world that can beget within us the certainty of God, He is the supreme fact. Dr. Morgan agrees with this, though he develops the position in his own way.

One of the great questions which a writer on this

subject has to face is whether Christianity is the final religion and in what respects or on what grounds it is so. This question Dr. Morgan discusses at length, and he considers that the finality of Christianity depends on the answer to two questions: Can faith be shown to be the basis of religions? and, Can the great Christian values maintain their claim to be eternal? He has no difficulty in answering both questions in the affirmative.

The whole discussion of fundamental problems in this book is from beginning to end stimulating and illuminating. Dr. Morgan leaves nothing within the sphere of his subject untouched. The Nature of Religion, the Idea of Revelation, the relations of Religion to Science and Philosophy (particularly well handled), the Structure of Dogma, the Bible, the Essence of Christianity, the Finality of Christianity, and Religion's Right and Value, are all discussed with a refreshing frankness and a satisfying fullness. On the general lines of his argument Dr. Morgan will carry most readers with him. In his discussion of Christianity in particular, however, he will not find the same assent, and he will give much less satisfaction. But in any case he has written a very able and in many ways original book, and no one can read it without feeling that he has been in contact with a strong and a deeply religious mind.

THE MISSIONARY IDEA.

Professor J. F. McFadyen, M.A., D.D., of Kingston, Canada (who is not to be confused with his brother, the Professor of Old Testament Studies in Glasgow), has written a book on *The Missionary Idea in Life and Religion* (T. & T. Clark; 6s.). We all remember the publication of the Professor's 'Jesus and Life.' It was hailed in these columns as a book of supreme insight and originality, and it has always seemed to us fully as attractive and illuminating as Dr. Glover's famous book. The qualities which made 'Jesus and Life' so welcome are seen in this new work, which is part of the 'Life and Religion' series. Dr. McFadyen could not make any subject uninteresting, but as a matter of fact his present subject is one in which his whole heart is concerned, for he himself was a distinguished missionary before he was called to teach the New Testament to theological students. The truest thing we could say of this book on the missionary enterprise is that it is a fascinating treatment of a great subject, and that no aspect of it is omitted. The historical side, the apologetic side, the objections to missions, the real missionary motive, the tests of missionary success, the hindrances to progress, the actual achievements and fruits of missions—all this and much more is handled with a fullness, a competence, an amplitude of resource, an interest and persuasiveness which could come only from knowledge and insight used by an unusual power of exposition. It would not be easy to find any book of this kind and on this subject to match Professor McFadyen's.

THE CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

The Preface to the fifth volume of *The Cambridge Medieval History* (Cambridge University Press; 50s. net)—that monumental work which was planned by Professor Bury—opens with a note of sadness. Before the fourth volume appeared, two of the contributors to it, Sir Edwin Pears and M. Ferdinand Chalandon, died, and now before the issue of the fifth volume, Count Ugo Balzani, who writes on 'Italy from 1125–1152,' and Mr. W. J. Corbett, who is responsible for chapters xv. and xvi., 'The Development of the Duchy of Normandy and the Norman Conquest' and 'The Internal History of England from 1087–1154,' have also passed away. In view of all the difficulties—in one case a complete chapter had to be written at very short notice—the uniform high standard of the volume reflects the greatest credit on the joint editors, J. R. Tanner, Litt.D., C. W. Previté-Orton, M.A., and Z. N. Brooke, M.A.

The present volume has the title 'Contest of Empire and Papacy.' It deals roughly with the years A.D. 1050–1200; but so far as the internal history of Europe is concerned, it confines itself to Germany, France, and England, leaving the less important countries for the following volume. The first chapter is a very interesting study by Professor Whitney on 'The Reform of the Church' which is 'not merely a prelude to, but also a principal cause of the striking events that followed.' But the great secular conflict between Pope and Emperor is not the only one dealt with. There was the second struggle going on, between Europe and the Infidel, and so we have four authoritative and well-documented chapters dealing with the Crusades. Chapters vi. and vii., on 'Islam in Syria and Egypt' and 'The First Crusade,' are by Professor William B. Stevenson; chapter viii. on 'The Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1099–1291,' by Charles Lethbridge Kingsford, late Scholar of St. John's College, Oxford; and chapter ix. on 'The Effects of the Crusades upon Western Europe,' by E.

J. Passant, Fellow of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

That this history is a necessity for the student of Medievalism, that it is thoroughly scholarly, that it is packed with information, that it is detailed and at the same time comprehensive, that each chapter is the work of an expert will be freely granted. It will be freely granted, too, that this method of writing history ensures that every period shall not only be the work of an expert, but shall be something which that expert has made particularly his own. What criticisms can be made then? Perhaps a lack of homogeneity, or possibly a dullness which is not found in a history which comes from the pen of a single great historian. But this volume, at any rate, is not dull, for the movements lend themselves to being grouped round great personalities, and full advantage is taken of this to make the history living. The three greatest are Pope Gregory VII., who 'dominated the second half of the eleventh century, and the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa the second half of the twelfth, and in the middle period the Cistercian abbot, St. Bernard, fills the centre of the stage.' There are Urban II., too—see the brilliant characterization on pp. 81 ff.—the Emperor Henry VI., William the Conqueror, Anselm, Abelard, and many others.

It is impossible to go into detail, and invidious, where everything is so good, to single out, but we cannot refrain from saying with what appreciation we have read two brilliant articles, that on 'Monastic Orders,' by Professor Alexander Hamilton Thompson, Professor of Medieval History in the University of Leeds, and that on 'Philosophy in the Middle Ages,' by the Sub-Warden of Keble College, Oxford, W. H. V. Reade. The value of the work is enhanced by an excellent Introduction by Mr. Brooke, by the full bibliographies to each chapter, and by the ten maps which are supplied with the volume, but not bound up with it.

DR. SHEPHERD OF UDAIPUR.

It is not yet a year since the death in his native city of Aberdeen of the Rev. James Shepherd, M.D., D.D., K.I.H.M., and already we have the latest romance of the mission field in India under the title *Shepherd of Udaipur*, by the Rev. George Carstairs, B.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). Within the compass of a single volume of three hundred pages Mr. Carstairs has written a fascinating record of the forty years' labours of one of the most notable Christian missionaries of our time. Mr. Carstairs had the advantage of being himself a missionary in the great Indian Province of Rajputana, and was thus familiar with all the difficulties that confronted a pioneer of the Christian gospel in a native State where Hinduism was the ancient faith of ruler and people. Here is another of the many striking examples of how great results may follow from the humblest beginnings. 'A certain Miss Melville ran a Bible Class which had a wonderful influence upon boys and girls who attended it. No less than five of her pupils devoted themselves to foreign mission work—Dr. Laws of Livingstonia, Mrs. Laws, Dr. Webster of Manchuria, the Rev. Alexander Cruickshank of Old Calabar, and James Shepherd. It is hardly to be doubted that Miss Melville's influence had much to do with turning his thoughts to the foreign field.' As Rudyard Kipling says, Dr. Shepherd arrived at the cure of souls through the curing of bodies. The Maharana on the throne, the poorest among his subjects, and the untutored tribes among the mountain fastnesses all alike came under the spell of this Aberdeen doctor. It was the building and equipment of a hospital that was his first work, but to this he added the building of a Christian church; for, keen doctor though he was, eagerness to preach the gospel was the ruling passion of his life. His religion was so sane and so sincere that he won the respect even of those who had no sympathy with his religion. He had a terrible experience during the great famine of 1899, and again during an outbreak of cholera. No soldier ever decorated with the Victoria Cross showed more of a spirit of consistent self-sacrifice than Dr. Shepherd in these critical days. He is only one of that wonderful apostolic succession of men who have given their lives to work on the mission field.

HEBREW CIVILIZATION.

There is no lack of good commentaries on the Old Testament, or of books, large and small, on the Religion of Israel. But what the student of the Old Testament did need was a book which would illustrate on an ample scale the secular background of Israel's religious experience. This want has now been more than satisfactorily supplied by Professor Alfred Bertholet in his *History of Hebrew Civilization* (Harrap; 12s. 6d. net), which has been admirably translated by the Rev. A. K. Dallas, M.A., whose translation reads throughout like an original. Bertholet is singularly well qualified for this important task. As long ago as 1911 he wrote the second volume of the 'Biblische Theologie des alten

Testaments' begun by Stade, and he has much other competent work to his credit. In this bulky volume of four hundred pages he has grappled with every aspect and every period of Israel's civilization, beginning indeed at the prehistoric period and devoting no less than a fourth of the book to civilization in Palestine before the coming of Israel, making full use of the material furnished by recent excavations.

Within the definitely historical period he discusses Israel's family and domestic life, dealing in detail under this rubric with the clan, family, marriage, children, slaves, dwelling, clothing, food, etc.; then he passes on to trades and callings, social life, political life, and intellectual life, under which head he discusses Hebrew jurisprudence, what Israel knew, plastic art, music, literature, and religion. One effect of the book is to show how impossible it is to discuss the intellectual life of Israel with the least adequacy without implicating religious matters in the discussion. Israel's God was her glory, her religion was her supreme and only contribution to the world, and into her jurisprudence and her conception of history no less than into her prophetic messages and her cultic songs religion is indissolubly interwoven. Bertholet well says, in discussing the interrelations of Babylonian and Hebrew jurisprudence, that 'Jahweh was a God of law and morality in quite a different sense from the Babylonian Shamash,' and he also points out that the conception of the teleology of history is the great achievement of the Hebrew mind. Thus, though the book professedly deals with Hebrew civilization, Bertholet lets drop by the way many illuminating words on Hebrew religion, as, for example, when he points out that the conception of Jahweh as a 'God from afar,' implying as it does His power to work at a distance, helped to spiritualize the conception of God and powerfully promoted faith in Jahweh's power to affect history.

There is not a dull line in the book. It is full of concrete touches which together constitute a living picture of ancient Hebrew civilization in every expression of its life. With justice the publishers claim for it that a more luminous background of Old Testament literature does not exist, and that this will be an unusually welcome book.

THE MYTH OF CONSTANTINE.

In *Myth and Constantine the Great* (Milford; 10s. net) the Rev. Vacher Burch, D.D., Lecturer in Theology, Liverpool Cathedral, examines the myth of Constantine afresh in the light of the postulate of a primal *Vita Constantini*, which was not of Near-Eastern but of Roman-Sabine origin. He contends that it was the pre-Christian factor in the primal *Vita Constantini* that gave the myth its shape: 'the Bull pulled the Synagogue and the Ecclesias in its train.' The investigation is conducted with impressive learning and scholarship, and with a vivacity, skill, and suggestiveness uncommon in such investigations. The acceptance of the fundamental hypothesis of the book would radically modify the Constantine-Silvester tradition, which had such vogue in the Middle Age. For example, Constantine could no longer be regarded as a believer in a Christology based on the historic Person of Jesus Christ. Nor could he be regarded as a multitudinous builder of Christian churches: 'the dust of one Sol shrine was turned into the soaring walls of many churches.' Nor could he be regarded as having dedicated churches to persons: 'the foundation of the basilica of S. Peter rests on the same foundation as the Roman baptism of Constantine at the hands of Pope Silvester.' Thus, according to Dr. Burch, the real Constantine knew little or nothing of Jesus Christ, and had no regard for Peter, and as little for Paul: 'he goes his way of pilgrimage, as the lost *Vita Constantini* would have told us, with the set of his spirit from his native Dacia joining naturally with the Sabine Apollo and Romano-Sabine worship of Sol; and it would proceed to narrate how when he came to the Golden Horn the faint shadow was pencilled on his spirit of a Shepherd's crook and a crown of thorns. There was not more than this tenuous shadow.'

THE ANGLICAN 'VIA MEDIA.'

The Rev. C. Sydney Carter, the Principal of the Bible Churchman's Missionary College, Bristol, has written an exceedingly able historical work which he calls *The Anglican 'Via Media,'* being studies in the Elizabethan Religious Settlement and in the teaching of the Caroline Divines (Thynne & Jarvis; 3s. 6d. net). The thesis of the book is that historically the Anglican Church has stood definitely on the side of the Reformed Churches of Christendom. He contends that the assertion so often made that the Church of England 'stands midway between Rome and Protestant Christendom' is a historical error, and that if the Church of England is to make any changes in her doctrine of worship she should at least do so in full view of what her historical witness has been. Consequently he examines in great detail, and with a wealth of learning, the actual situation at the time of the Elizabethan

Settlement and later on under the Caroline Divines, and finds no evidence whatever of a trustworthy kind to support the Anglo-Catholic view of history. The reader must be content to go over the ground under this competent guidance. The case seems very strong as it is stated here, and Dr. Knox, the former Bishop of Manchester, is so satisfied with it that in a foreword he says it is so convincing that it would not be surprising if no notice were taken of the book by the Anglo-Catholic writers. This is rather hard on a very competent set of controversialists. But at all events this is a case which will task them severely. And as truth is the object of both sides, it is good to see the Reformed character of the Anglican Church so stoutly and ably maintained.

TWO BOOKS OF TRAVEL.

To the notable series of books of travel and exploration which the public owe to Messrs. Seeley, Service & Co., the latest additions deal with such far distant regions and different climes as Ashanti on the Gold Coast of equatorial East Africa and that little known peninsula Kamchatka in Eastern Siberia. *In Ashanti and Beyond* (21s. net), Mr. A. W. Cardinall, F.R.G.S., F.R.A.I., District Commissioner of the Gold Coast, fills another volume with the record of his experiences and with an account of the native tribes, their manners and customs. His reason is that so fast are times changing in what one used to look upon as savage Africa that an account of the passing ways and passing people of the Gold Coast is called for. People have forgotten that this country waged a costly war with the natives of Ashanti. But Coomassie, its capital, which in 1896 was described as reeking with human blood, is now a Europeanized native village as large as a small town, with cleaner streets than are to be found in the Naples of 1924. 'The Ashantis are remarkable for their extreme cleanliness; and they take a pride in themselves, their clothing and their houses.' Ashanti has not only its line of railway, but, like England, its Great North Road, leading to Timbuktu and the desert beyond. 'For construction it might well be a high road in England; but for traffic it must be well-nigh unique.' There is no distinctive feature of the country or of its native inhabitants and its animal and insect life with which this most interesting volume does not deal. Moreover, the illustrations of native life have been selected with skill and have been carefully reproduced.

The same can be said of the really valuable illustrations to the bulky volume, *Through Kamchatka by Dog-Sled and Skis* (21s. net), by a Swedish scientist, Sten Bergman, D.Sc., who, with his young and adventurous wife, made two journeys for scientific observation amongst the interesting and almost unknown peoples living in the most inaccessible parts of this remote Siberian Peninsula. Their hospitality to every visitor, a native or a foreigner, a European or an Asiatic, is the finest and the only fine characteristic of the people of Kamchatka. Their most repulsive characteristic is their drunkenness. And yet tea is drunk in tremendous quantities, invariably without sugar. Though the rule of the Moscow Soviet has penetrated the remotest parts of Siberia, the Kamchatkan Christmas Eve and Christmas Day are still observed by the peasantry with all the ceremonial of the Church. They like to congregate in the villages which have a church, and these are not numerous. The women dress in coloured silk dresses and replace their reindeer hide boots by high-heeled shoes bought from traders. The men wear jackets mostly, but some have frock-coats. The most dandified have celluloid collars with bright coloured rosettes. When the church bells begin to ring, the entire population, men, women, and children, stream out from their houses to a service which lasts several hours. Afterwards the priest visits as many houses as he is capable of before being overcome by too much liquor. The author has much to tell of his experiences among the little-known Koryak and Lamut tribes of nomads with their herds of reindeer. The former use the reindeer to draw their sledges, but never ride on them as the Lamuts do, thus enabling them to cover long distances. Sten Bergman's narrative of his adventurous journey reads like that of an explorer in the Arctic regions.

ARMINIANISM.

In his work, *The Beginnings of Arminianism* (University of London Press; 12s. 6d. net), the Rev. A. W. Harrison, M.C., B.Sc., D.D., Vice-Principal of Westminster Training College, publishes a thesis approved for the degree of D.D. in the University of London. It would appear that no such detailed account as this of the rise and early growth of Arminianism has been hitherto published in English. In telling the story, Dr. Harrison makes careful and patient use of the authorities, to which exact references are given. It is a story that enters deeply into the history of what Motley called the Dutch Republic, and Dr. Harrison does full justice to the political background of it. It

may be here remarked that he is less diffident in his political than in his theological judgments.

It may seem to us in these days that sublapsarian and supralapsarian are 'in one red burial blent,' but the theological issues involved in these and kindred terms were alive enough in the days when Arminius taught theology at Leiden, and was pursuing that quest of Divine truth which was the be-all and end-all of his existence. As Dr. Harrison tells us, 'the news of the strife in the University was soon carried to the market-place and the workshop, and weavers and woolcombers engaged in these deep themes without being quite sure on which side was Arminius and on which was Gomarus.'

About one-third of the book traces the career of Arminius; the remainder is devoted to the Great Remonstrance and to the events that led up to the formulation of the Canons of the Synod of Dort, due prominence being given to those great figures in the history of religious toleration, Barneveldt and Grotius. A useful feature of the book for students of the Reformed Theology is its inclusion of the text of the findings of the Synod of Dort, which is 'the classical statement of seventeenth-century Calvinism,' and which represents 'the religion of the Protestantism that counted at that time.'

A translation into English of the late Professor Wilhelm Herrmann's *Dogmatik* will be welcome to many. It appears under the title *Systematic Theology* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net), and has been carefully and competently done by Nathaniel Micklem, M.A., of the Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham, and Kenneth A. Saunders, M.A., B.Litt., of Solihull. The work appeared in German in 1925, and consisted of the dictated paragraphs of Herrmann's class lectures on Dogmatic Theology. These summaries were carefully prepared and their phraseology polished and repolished, so that although couched for the most part in general terms they present a very readable outline of the System of Christian Doctrine. The work is also very readable in the translation, and may well be recommended as a compendious text-book of Christian Theology on Ritschlian lines. The memorial sermon by Professor Rade which was included in the German edition has been excluded from the English translation.

The Rev. Canon Sell, D.D., is to be warmly congratulated on bringing his Commentary on the entire Old Testament to completion—an achievement as stupendous as it is brilliant. The volumes which have just appeared, and which complete the Commentary, are *The Undivided Kingdom*, *The Wisdom Literature*, and *Zechariah 9–14*, each of the former to be had for 2s. and the last for 6d. at the Bookroom of the Church Missionary Society, Salisbury Square, London, E.C.4. The first of the three volumes named deals with the story of Samuel, Saul, David, and Solomon in the form of a continuous commentary on the relevant Biblical sections in Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles; but very wisely here, as in the earlier volumes, Dr. Sell has adopted the paragraph, not the verse, as the basis of his comment, so that he concentrates only on the things of real importance. This he does with a very exhaustive knowledge of all the recent literature, magazines as well as books, which he supplements at important points by illustrative facts drawn from his unusually extensive knowledge of Oriental literature. This criticism applies equally to the volume on *The Wisdom Literature*, in which, with characteristic thoroughness, the Canon discusses not only Proverbs, but the Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus. It will mean much for those who are considerably less at home in the Apocrypha than in the Old Testament to have the drift and teaching of these important books presented in so lucid and attractive a manner within the compass of a single volume. The little volume on *Zechariah 9–14* supplements the earlier volume on 'The Minor Prophets.'

All the volumes of this series were written primarily with the needs of Indian pastors in view, to deliver them from the perils of obscurantism by furnishing them with a Commentary which would frankly embody the results of reverent critical scholarship, but which would be as earnest in emphasizing religious values as in portraying the historical background. In this aim the Commentary must be pronounced abundantly successful. It is 'edifying' in the best sense of the word, just alike to historical, critical, and spiritual interests; and it is well fitted to render to teachers and others in this country who may not have access to the more technical literature the same service as it is rendering to the pastors of India.

A new volume has been added by Messrs. James Clarke to their series of sermons for special occasions by representative preachers. The title is *Lenten Sermons* (5s. net). The representative preachers are the Very Rev. A. E. Burn, Rev. H. C. Carter, Rev. E. A. Down, Rev. Arthur John Gossip, Rev. H. Maldwyn Hughes, Very Rev. W. R. Inge, Very

Rev. W. Foxley Norris, Rev. T. H. Passmore, Rev. Canon T. Guy Rogers, Rev. Hubert L. Simpson, Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, and the Rev. V. F. Storr. While the sermons are varied, all are good. We give this month in shortened form, in 'The Christian Year,' Dean Inge's address on Joy and Sacrifice.

Much has been written recently on the bewildering changes that are taking place in the Middle East and throughout the whole Muslim world. The subject is of entrancing interest and of the weightiest import. In *Young Islam on Trek* (Edinburgh House Press; 2s. net), Mr. Basil Mathews has given, in his own vivid and inimitable way, a fascinating picture of the whole scene as it appears to him after years of special study. His conclusion is that the movements of change in the life of young Islam are 'world-wide, deep, and transforming; that they grow progressively; and that they do create a situation without parallel in the thirteen centuries of the life of Islam. Nor is Islam alone concerned. For the whole life of the world, its progress or its retrogression, its peace or its war, is bound up with the direction in which the Islamic world moves in its new renaissance. For this is in the strict and rare sense a renaissance of a civilization. . . . What kind of a new world may be born out of this new renaissance? The wonder of the situation for us is that this decision as to what direction that renaissance will take will almost certainly be made in our lifetime. And we can share in creating the forces that will determine that direction.' The book is 'written for youth about youth'; it is full of colour and incident, and is well fitted to fire the imagination of generous young hearts.

If any one wishes a short, well-informed, and telling criticism of spiritualistic phenomena it will be found in *Christianity and Spiritualism*, by Mr. Arthur B. Bateman (Epworth Press; 2s. net). This little book is by no means purely controversial, but contains an amount of positive Christian teaching of a high order in regard to the life eternal.

The Rev. Frank Ballard, D.D., B.Sc., so long and favourably known as a keen defender of the faith against rationalism and popular scepticism, has published a really interesting book, in which he sums up the final conclusions which he has reached after a long life of thought and search. *Christian Findings after Fifty Years: A Retrospective Summary*, is the title (Epworth Press; 6s. net). The writer has changed his views to some extent. His 'findings' may be described as distinctly modernist. That is a general description. On all questions of criticism, of emphasis, and even of doctrine, this book takes the modern view. It is not in any sense negative. Dr. Ballard is as positive as ever and is sound on the essential points. But he takes his own way, and it leads him in the path of present-day wider views. The book goes over the whole ground—God, Christ, the Bible, Sin, the Atonement, Sacraments, and Eschatology on the doctrinal side, and Conversion, Public Worship, Preaching on the practical side. Dr. Ballard is definitely on the side of a Christian spiritualism. He thinks the case for actual communication from the other side has been made out, and sees no reason why Christians should not accept this welcome confirmation of a spiritual faith. The whole book is alive with the vitality of a mind that is always engaged on big things, and it is well worth reading for that alone.

John Edwin Watts-Ditchfield, First Bishop of Chelmsford (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net), has been fortunate in his biographer. Within the three hundred pages of a modest volume, Mr. Ellis N. Gowing has written the story of a crowded and remarkable life that may well be an inspiration for every clergyman and minister of religion. Reared in the Wesleyan Church, he was educated for the Wesleyan ministry. At the conclusion of his training, however, there were more students in the college than vacancies in the circuits. He thought the door of the Wesleyan ministry was closed, and joined the Church of England. At the age of thirty-one he was ordained priest in St. Paul's Cathedral. He had already begun his life's work as a curate of St. Peter's, Upper Holloway, and darkest London was to afford the scope for his gifts, amounting to genius, for every form of religious and social organization, especially among men of the working class. While he was still an assistant curate he decided to put into operation his idea of a special and regular weekly service for men. 'The aim and object of this service,' he wrote, 'is to lead men through Christ to a higher, purer, and nobler life in God, and to prove that Christianity is not a failure, but the one thing that can make a true man—a gentleman, indeed, in the highest sense—one who is all that he ought to be in himself, and does all that he ought to do for his brother men.' 'Get to *know* the men. This can only be done by visiting them in their homes, and reaching them *individually*' was one of his workaday maxims. But he did not forget the women. 'One afternoon he called at the house of a poor woman who made her living by mangling, and invited her to go to the Women's

Service. "I'm sorry I can't, sir," was the reply, "I've just had this basket of mangling come in, and it's got to be delivered before to-morrow morning." "Never mind," said Watts-Ditchfield, "you get ready for church, and I'll do the mangling." ' Watts-Ditchfield's greatest work was done as Vicar of what might be described as a derelict parish in Bethnal Green. The record of his work there is a marvellous testimony to what may be done by one man in earnest who does not hesitate if needs be 'to do the mangling.' What he was as curate and as vicar he was in like manner as the first Bishop of Chelmsford. He was an evangelical Churchman, but he knew how to get the best out of the High Church clergy in the Diocese. He died somewhat suddenly in the full tide of his activities, but he had lived an extraordinarily active and eminently useful life.

In brief compass, but with thoroughly just perspective, Mr. Edward A. Annett has described the too little known period between Malachi and Matthew in a book to which he has given the name of *The Hidden Centuries*, and which is published at 2s. 6d. net by Messrs. Hunter & Longhurst. In broad lines the picture is sketched from the years of disillusionment that followed the return from Babylon to the revival of the Jewish spirit under the Maccabees and to the decline and servitude by which that revival was succeeded. A brief sketch of some of the more important books of the Apocrypha is given, and an account of the ideas which dominated the last century B.C. The book forms an introduction, all the more useful that it is short and simple, to a period of which one must know something in order to understand the New Testament. It is written as a manual for teachers, and to them it will be specially useful.

A little book of really immense value has been written by the headmaster of Eton, the Rev. Cyril Alington, D.D., on *Elementary Christianity* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). It is a book of apologetics dealing with three things—Belief about God, the Divinity of Christ, and the Difficulties (intellectual and moral) that stand in the way of the acceptance of these truths. The order of the treatment is suggestive. Dr. Alington strongly dissents from the view that begins with the Divinity of Christ. He says that it is wrong to ask anybody to believe in this truth before he knows what 'divinity' means. He points out that Jesus Himself took the other way and asked men to think first of the nature of God and their duty to Him. And indeed we ought to begin with Jesus Himself as He presented Himself as a 'teacher come from God' and learn to believe higher things of Him as we learn more of Him.

It would be difficult to over-praise this little book. Much more pretentious and much larger books have far less to say than Dr. Alington manages to put into his hundred pages. Each of the three sections is admirable, but perhaps the best is the last, where, with great freedom and breadth of mind, the writer deals with the obstacles to faith. He is so 'broad' about some things that we fancy the Bishop of London would hesitate to repeat his foreword when he comes home and actually reads the book. One sentence, for example, is as follows: 'It is not too much to say that the presence of the Thirty-nine Articles in the Prayer Book is to many would-be Christians a standing proof, if not of intellectual dishonesty, at least of a curious indifference to the truth.' It would be misleading to suggest that the book is in any sense negative. The whole argument is positive and helpful to faith. But it is the argument of a modern mind that is always looking to actualities. This is a book to give to doubters and all earnest seekers.

It is quite certain that no one was asleep when Dr. Charles E. Jefferson was delivering his ten sermons on the *Cardinal Ideas of Isaiah* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net). They constitute an almost ideal example of the way in which a skilful and well-informed preacher can turn the results of critical study to popular and profitable account. There is hardly a word to which the keenest critic could object, and there is not a word to which the average man would not listen with intelligence and alacrity. All the great ideas of Isaiah are here dealt with—the remnant, the Messiah, the social vision, a warless world, the day of the Lord—dealt with in a way that is at once just to the original situation and thoroughly informative, and yet in a way which tingles with applicability to the life of to-day. Dr. Jefferson claims to be a practical preacher: no one who reads these educative and inspiring discourses will dispute this claim. He preaches the 'old' gospel, the 'simple' gospel, but points out very convincingly that that is largely a social gospel which, if accepted, would make short work of the conditions on Ellis Island. As Isaiah pleaded for the Holy One of Israel, Dr. Jefferson pleads for the Holy One of the United States and of New York City. He loves the prophets and reminds us that in the religion of Jesus there is no room for the priest, who is not mentioned among the gifts of God

to the Church in Eph $4^{11ff.}$. The style is a model of simplicity and lucidity, and each sermon is as aglow with religious and moral passion as it is full of interest. Ministers could learn from this masterly book how to acquaint their congregations with a great Biblical book and a great spiritual genius.

The Portraits of Jesus Christ in the New Testament, by the Rev. H. S. Coffin, D.D. (Macmillan ; 4s. 6d. net), contains a series of eight expository sermons which present Jesus as portrayed in the four Gospels, the Acts, the Pauline Epistles, Hebrews, and the Apocalypse. Having been preached to a leading congregation in New York, they are an evidence that expository preaching, though it may be, as Dr. Fort Newton has remarked, 'well-nigh impossible in America,' is still possible when well done. The exposition here is careful, sound, and scholarly, while its bearing on present-day life is brought out with force and impressiveness.

The National Sunday School Union continues in 'Every Teacher's Library' (2s. 6d. net) the issue of their excellent manuals for teachers. Volumes 12 and 13 have come to hand, and they fully maintain the high quality of the series. Indeed, the question might be raised whether the standard is not pitched too high for the ordinary Sunday School teacher.

The Teacher's Allies, by Professor John G. M'Kenzie, M.A., B.D., is an admirable study in the psychology of religious education. After discussing the innate and acquired interests which may become the teacher's allies if rightly developed and guided, the writer proceeds to give sound counsels regarding religion in the home and in the Sunday School. He has some timely things to say about adolescence, pointing out that it is not really '*the* important period in character formation. . . . It is not the seed-time ; it is the period when whatever has rooted itself in the mind of the child begins to manifest itself in consciousness.'

The Gospel in the New Testament, by Professor C. H. Dodd, M.A., is a very fresh presentation of the main religious purport of the New Testament and of the various ways in which it is stated and developed by the several writers. Students will find much that is stimulating and suggestive, but here and there one is conscious of touches of comfortable arm-chair criticism of saints and apostles who are contending, not without blood and sweat, in the arena.

In the Devotional Commentary published by the Religious Tract Society we have had a number of excellent books, and we have had occasion recently to praise the general level attained. This must be repeated in the case of the most recent volume, on *The Second Epistle of St. Peter, the Second and Third Epistles of St. John, and the Epistle of St. Jude*, by the Rev. Professor D. Dawson-Walker, M.A., D.D., of the University of Durham (3s. 6d. net). This book is learned, able, and entirely suited to the devotional aim of the series. The writer gives an intelligent introduction and then proceeds on the lines of the well-known books by Bishop Moule. He mingles text and commentary, indicating the words of Scripture by distinctive black type, and following each section or verse or phrase thus quoted by explanations which carry on and explain the argument, and also bring out the points that need illumination for the understanding of the Epistles. The thing is well done, and any one who wishes to understand and appreciate those letters particularly on the practical and devotional sides could not do better than find his way through them with the help of this competent guide.

Dr. R. E. Speer is perhaps best known as a missionary statesman, but he has also done excellent work in the exposition of Christian truth. *Seeking the Mind of Christ* (Revell ; $1.50) is 'a gathering together of some devotional papers on different aspects of the mind of Christ as revealed in the New Testament and in Christian experience.' Under each of the general headings of The Christian Salvation, The Christian Character, The Christian Discipline, The Christian Temper, and The Christian Standard, are groups of short papers, rich in Christian teaching, devotional in spirit, and aptly illustrated by quotations from current literature. They make most wholesome and pleasant reading.

Resurrection, and Other Essays on Man and his Eternal Destiny, by Mr. H. T. Wills, M.A., B.Sc. (Elliot Stock ; 1s. net), is a warm defence of the doctrine of conditional immortality. The earnestness and ability of the writer are manifest, and he has many weighty and Christian things to say, but the spirit he manifests towards those who differ from him, and the readiness with which he imputes their views to 'camouflage' and 'Satanic and Bolshevistic influences' is distasteful to charitable readers. It also indicates a certain want of that humility and sense of human ignorance which befit the discussion of so mysterious a subject.

'Not long ago the distinguished President of a

Canadian University, who was visiting England, expressed his surprise at the small amount of intelligent knowledge that most of the educated people he met seemed to possess of the meaning and interest of the books of the Bible.' In *The Christianity of the Epistles* (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net), Canon A. W. Robinson, D.D., has written a book which, if studied, should do something to wipe away this reproach. It contains a study of eight of the Epistles, bringing out with great clearness their historical setting and the writer's message. The chapters were prepared for use in study circles and are admirably fitted for that purpose.

The University of Chicago Press publications on religious education are about the best that come to us from the other side. Some time ago we reviewed Mrs. Elizabeth Miller Lobingier's 'Stories of Shepherd Life,' which was designed to describe the nomadic life of the Hebrews. She has followed that book up with another on *Hebrew Home Life*, which has as its object the description of the life of the Hebrews after they settled down as agriculturists. The work consists of two separate books, *A Children's Reader* (4s. 6d. net), and a *Teacher's Manual* (7s. 6d. net). Both are published in this country by the Cambridge University Press. The former volume consists of a series of readings in story form to illustrate 'How Shepherds became Farmers,' 'New Homes,' 'Farms and Crops,' 'The Harvest Festival,' and many other aspects and incidents of Hebrew home life. The *Teacher's Manual* consists of careful and detailed directions for working out these readings into lessons, how to carry them through, and what expression work to give. Mrs. Lobingier's ability in this direction is well known, and these lessons are the result of actual and prolonged experience in which they were tested by being taught over and over again. We recommend the two books strongly to teachers on this side. The Americans are making many experiments in religious education, and some of these are worth careful consideration. Here is one.

The sketch of the distinguished career of *Ernest De Witt Burton* (University of Chicago Press; 15s. net), late President of the University of Chicago, has been written by his associate and intimate friend, Thomas Wakefield Goodspeed, in a form that appears unusual in this country. It is in two chapters, entitled 'The First Fifty Years' and 'His Larger Life,' the whole contained within less than a hundred pages. This may seem an inadequate treatment of one who was often spoken of by men who were themselves eminent in the scholarly world as 'our most eminent New Testament scholar,' and who moreover played a leading part in the development of the university life of the United States. Despite the limitation he has imposed on himself, however, Mr. Goodspeed has drawn an impressive portrait of a remarkable man. He was the son of a remarkable woman, devoted all her life to Sunday School and missionary work. It was the mission field that first attracted him, but ill-health made him hesitate, and his election as an associate professor of the Baptist Theological Seminary of New England decided his career. A few years later he was appointed head of the New Testament department of the University of Chicago. Theological scholars in this country are familiar with his best work, on the Epistle to the Galatians. He was assailed as one of the higher critics, but he held on his way confident that it was his duty to seek for truth with all his power and teach it calmly and wisely. 'As I look out with such vision as I have upon the problems which confront the Church to-day, both in this country and in non-Christian lands,' he wrote, 'it is not the men who with conscientious caution and courage are accepting and teaching what are called modern views who are hindering the progress of Christianity, but those who are in many cases refusing to examine the evidence, and denouncing those who have done so.'

Present-Day Faiths.

Evangelicalism within the Church of England.

By the Reverend W. H. Rigg, D.D., Vicar of Beverley Minster, E. Yorks.

The late Baron Von Hügel, in his monumental work on mysticism, says that there are three elements to be found in the great religions of the world, and notably in Christianity. They may be grouped under the following heads: 'the traditional, historic, external, the "Petrine" school; the reasoning, speculative-internal, the Pauline; and the experimental, mystical-internal, the Johannine school.'[1] A few pages further on, the writer refers to the Anglican Church as an illustration of his main thesis: 'For in Anglicanism, the most characteristic of its parties, the High Church school, represents predominantly the historical, institutional principle. The Latitudinarian school fights for the Rational, Critical, and Speculative element. The Evangelical school stands in close spiritual affinity to all but the Unitarian Nonconformists in England, and represents the Experimental, Mystical element.'[2] On the whole, we consider that this is a very fair description of the place we hold in the life of the Church of England of to-day. Not that in the very least we seek to deny that amongst the other groups in our Church there are many of a mystical type of mind whose profound spiritual experience forms the basis of their religious life. Indeed, in some of the Churches where the most elaborate ceremonial is practised, and advanced teaching of an Anglo-Catholic type is given, the most Evangelical sermons are delivered. Those who have been fortunate enough to hear the late Father Stanton, or Father Vernon of the present day, will have listened to address after address to which no exception could be taken, for they were, to use a popular expression, thoroughly Gospel sermons.

It may, then, be asked, 'Why limit the designation "Evangelical" to a particular group?' 'What right has any party in the Church to monopolize that noble word?' Our justification for so doing must be prefaced by the frank admission that at best it is but a rough designation, 'labels are libels.' In public estimation, however, the term 'Evangelical' stands for that particular party in the Anglican communion whose belief and teaching centre in the Cross, and whose worship is characterized by simplicity. For the sake of clearness we must confine our attention to those who thus designate themselves, and if we are blamed for confining the term 'Evangelical' within such narrow limits, can but plead that the other groups have appropriated to themselves titles to which we also have a right.

Furthermore, it is our object to avoid teaching which incurs the danger of obscuring the Gospel message, or what is worse, of whittling it away so as to make men wonder whether Christianity contains any Gospel, any good news at all. Hence Evangelicalism is a protest as well as a witness. It has a negative aspect to it, though of far greater importance is its positive side. It regards with the gravest suspicion any teaching which obscures the direct access of the soul to Christ, *e.g.* the practice of the Invocation of the Saints and Sacramental Confession. It is not, however, averse from private confession, provided that 'the object aimed at is not that the penitent may obtain forgiveness, but that he may be assured of it,' and that it is not regarded as the normal practice of the Christian life, but a special means to a special end, one aid amongst others towards the restoration of a broken fellowship with Christ.

Sufficient has been said to lead our readers to expect that in the Evangelical section of the Church of England there will be very strong opposition to doctrines and practices regarded as mediæval. Their surmise will not be incorrect. Occasionally the dislike manifested by Evangelicals for Roman Catholicism, or anything which savours of Romanism, takes very extreme forms. There are even to-day a few who regard the Antichrist of the Apocalypse as representing the Pope of Rome, but *all* feel that the debt spiritual religion owes to the Reformation is incalculable, and are not ashamed to call themselves Protestants. This does not imply that they are blind to the mistakes and failings of the Reformers, or to the fact that the great movement of the sixteenth century, like any other entrusted to human hands, betrayed serious weaknesses and excesses. In view, however, of the aggressive attitude adopted by Roman Catholics towards our own Church, and other Christian bodies

[1] *The Mystical Element of Religion*, vol. i. p. 61 (London: J. M. Dent & Co. Second impression, 1909).
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 63.

in our land, such publications as the weekly *Record* and the quarterly magazine, *The Churchman*, render invaluable service to our Church in reminding us of the spiritual benefits which Protestantism has conferred upon mankind, and that she has a lawful and abiding place in the Church of England. Coupled with this distrust of Romanism, there has been displayed in the past a strong antipathy towards Tractarianism and its successors of to-day.

Not a few assert that these have no rightful place in the Church of England, and that the Anglo-Catholic position is irreconcilable with the Thirty-nine Articles, which some followers of the school have humorously designated 'the forty stripes save one.' Many a truth is expressed under cover of a jest! Nevertheless, a growing number of us consider that the limits of the Anglican Church are very much wider than our spiritual forefathers would have admitted. We believe that our branch of the Christian Church is a microcosm of Christianity, that the three elements of religion alluded to by Von Hügel, and quoted at the beginning of this article, must be allowed to have full play, and that if the Anglican Church can rise to the height of her calling, surmount her difficulties, and resolve her discords, she may yet serve Christianity as no other Church in this our day can do. In other words, by her affinities with Rome on the one side, and Geneva on the other, may she not help to bring together the separated bodies of Christendom, so that they shall manifest a unity of such a character that even the world, perforce against its own will, must become convinced of the Divine mission of the Church of Christ? Such a belief may often be subject to very severe strain, but we believe the possibility of its realization lies in the willingness on the part of Evangelicals to co-operate with Anglo-Catholics in evangelistic and social work, as well as in retreats and devotional services; and a like willingness to continue to foster the most cordial relations with the Free Churches, and also the Church of Scotland.

Here we must record a most notable fact which cannot fail to influence the future of Evangelicalism, the rise and growth of a liberal spirit within her, commonly called Liberal Evangelicalism. In the article on 'Evangelicalism' which Dr. Stalker contributed to the fifth volume of the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS he devoted a section to its appearance in the Church of England, but since this was written there has been considerable development.

There are still Evangelicals whose watchword is to stand in the old paths, and who look upon all forms of modernism as imperilling the very foundations of Christianity. In 1925 a volume of essays by various contributors, edited by Mr. Russell Howden,[1] appeared, in which all the old positions of Evangelicalism are stoutly maintained. The need for restating the eternal verities, in view of advancing knowledge, is denied, on the ground that this would demand a fresh revelation every few years,[2] whilst Mr. Manley rejecting, as he does, the verbal inerrancy of the Bible in detail, yet propounds a theory of inspiration not very far removed from it. The Bible is not a text-book of science, yet it propounds no scientific error. 'It *is* the Word of God, and not that it *contains* it.'[3] What is associated with the critical theory is rejected without qualification, since, in Mr. Manley's opinion, it has been annihilated by recent archæological discoveries, and there is evidence to show that the Pentateuch was, in the main, compiled in the time of Moses from contemporary or earlier documents. This being so, it should be taken at its own valuation and as it stands, as a revelation from God written down for our learning. Perhaps the most startling statement in a somewhat startling book occurs in a passage concerning our Lord's own attitude towards the Old Testament: 'He displays no horror at the acts attributed to Jehovah in its pages, and shows no trace of finding in it either contradiction or inconsistency.'[4]

If the Evangelicals were narrowed down to include those only who adopt a rigid theory of inspiration, and consider that no adjustment is necessary in order to bring the expression of our faith into closer harmony with the increased knowledge of the day, then would many of us, much against our wills, and with deep sorrow in our hearts, be compelled to find our spiritual home elsewhere within the Church.

From such a step we have been delivered by the conviction that modern criticism and the assured results of science are not contrary to the fundamental beliefs of the Gospel, and this has found expression in two books, one of which appeared at the beginning of 1923, and the other towards the end of 1925, entitled respectively *Liberal Evangelicalism* and *The Inner Life*.[5]

[1] *Evangelicalism* (London: Charles J. Thynne & Jarvis Ltd.).

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 175.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 137, 134.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 125.

[5] Besides these two books, mention should be made of the admirable series of pamphlets issued by the Evangelical Group Movement, many of which have

Neither of these was written by any one individual; both are the result of friends working together, and arriving at a more or less 'common mind' on the subject of religion. It is not proposed to give a summary of the opinions expressed in these two books. It is more important for our purpose to understand the spirit animating the writers than to consider their particular conclusions. They represent in a very striking manner the ideals and aspirations of the new movement, and, like voyagers who have put out to sea, they are prepared to take the wind in their faces. 'Progress,' says Canon Rogers, 'is the law of theology as well as of science, and the truth at which we can arrive at any given moment is only relative. "Faith in Christ is dynamic, not static." It is false to the spirit of Christianity to prejudge a living issue to-day by what St. Thomas Aquinas "said" or what the Thirty-nine Articles "allow." It is precisely because we are so often ground to pieces in the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury between the upper millstone of St. Thomas and the lower millstone of the Articles that we present to the world a dreary and desolating appearance.'[1] The truth of God is eternal, but our mode of apprehending it must vary from age to age, and is conditioned by the ideas and conceptions of the times in which we live. The traditional theory of inspiration must be discarded; it has often led to Bibliolatry. The ultimate basis of authority is the Living God, ever revealing Himself to mankind 'in many forms and fashions,' πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, and at length disclosing Himself in His Son, Jesus Christ. For the Christian the one touchstone of truth and reality in the sphere of religion must be the mind and spirit of Christ. Hence any doctrine which lays claim to our acceptance must submit itself to the acid test of its accordance, or otherwise, with the teaching of Christ. From this it follows that the New Testament, which contains the record of that supreme life, must possess a unique authority, if for no other reason than that it is our one and only source of the historical life of Christ. Nor can the Old Testament Scriptures be passed by as of no account, since without them the Lord's message would be almost unintelligible. Not only do they form the background of His teaching, but they also give an account of a special people divinely prepared to receive the supreme revelation of God. Any rigid theory of inspiration is to be deprecated. In one sense the Bible should be treated as any other book, even though it must be recognized that 'spiritual things are spiritually discerned.' No child of the Reformation can say consistently, 'Hands off the Bible.' Historical criticism must be allowed to do her work, and if sometimes those who claim to be her representatives reach what appear to be fantastic and extravagant results, the only way to refute them is to show that they have not wielded aright the instruments of their craft. The Evangelical has full liberty to accept what is called the Graf-Wellhausen view of the Old Testament, if he considers that the evidence leads him in that direction.

In any case, the question as to the composition and literary character of the Old Testament documents must not be prejudged by an appeal to our Lord's usage of them. Loyalty to the Incarnate Son is quite compatible with the recognition that His authority here has its own well-defined limits. The Eternal Son, in being made Man, was born in time, and during His mortal life shared the limitations of humanity, accepting the ordinary knowledge current in His day. Upon the nature and character of God, our Lord possessed unerring knowledge and insight. The same may be said of what He has unfolded to us as to the meaning and destiny of man. But literary questions lay beyond His immediate horizon, and outside the range of His redemptive purpose.

We have felt compelled to traverse ground familiar to those acquainted with modern theological thought, for the simple reason that the questions involved have ceased to be merely matters of academic interest, and are very much alive to-day. Since the Great War, at the headquarters of the Church Missionary Society in Salisbury Square, London, a crisis arose when the relations between the old and the new views came up for discussion. At one time the tension became so great that the prospects of the inclusion of the Liberal Evangelicals in a share of the work of the Society looked extremely doubtful. Fortunately, wise and far-sighted counsels prevailed, and an understanding was reached between both the Conservative and Liberal wings: a small number, however, seceded, and formed the Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society. It has been complained that it was a thousand pities theological differences were ever allowed to obtrude themselves into missionary work. They were, however, certain to arise, for in countries like Japan and India questions of Biblical criticism are discussed amongst the students and educated classes, and would have in due time to be met.

been written by first-rate scholars. The publishers are Hodder & Stoughton, London.

[1] *Liberal Evangelicalism*, pp. 43, 44.

The future of Evangelicalism lies in the sympathetic and prayerful co-operation of both wings, for each needs the other. The Liberals must never forget the rock from which they are hewn. Christianity is essentially a religion of Redemption, man is a sinner and needs to be saved from the guilt and power of sin, and however it may be expressed, this salvation can be effected only by faith in, and identification with, the Saviour's atoning sacrifice offered up on Calvary's Cross. The surrender of the soul to Christ crucified, risen, and ascended, and personal holiness wrought by the reception of the Indwelling Christ within the heart through the power of the Holy Ghost, are demanded of every individual, and are a form of individualism, for which no apology is needed, and without which corporate action, in so far as it is Christian, is of little worth. The Conservatives in their turn must be willing to ascribe the highest motives of love of truth and devotion to those whose opinions on Biblical criticism, and theories it may be of the Atonement, and of the relationship of the Divine and the human in the Person of our Blessed Lord, they do not share. The cause of religion in our country will best be served by both seeking to understand and appreciate each other, working side by side with each other in the same parishes, and serving on the committees of the same societies.

'Everything is in a state of transition' is a statement which has almost become a commonplace, and we are not afraid to admit that it applies to our group in the Anglican communion. 'Where is such and such a view going to lead you?' is the troubled and anxious question often put to us. 'We do not mind where it leads so long as it leads us to the truth,' is our reply. It is lack of faith to be afraid of truth, for truth is of God.[1] This spirit has become broadcast in the Evangelical party of to-day, so that its members are manifesting an attitude of readiness to learn from any quarter, regardless of how suspect it has been in the past; and they are fired also with the resolve to grapple with the intellectual problems of the day, and hope to make their contribution to the cause, if not by actually solving them, at least by showing that Christianity in the best sense is a reasonable religion. But they cannot, and will not, forget their ancestry. The noble works which God did in past days through their fathers must needs be treasured up and recalled by their sons, if only to make them humble and inspire them to emulate their efforts.

Both at home and abroad Evangelicals laboured incessantly for the spread of the Gospel and the conversion of sinners. They have been used of God as an example to the Church in missionary zeal. The Church Missionary Society, founded in 1799, has a noble record behind it, and its history forms one of the great romances of Christianity. This year the Church in Uganda, which, apart from the Roman Catholic Missions, owes its Christianity entirely to the C.M.S., is celebrating its jubilee. Fifty years are a short time, and yet within that period a vigorous Church has been founded and organized, numbering to-day 165,000 baptized members, 43,000 of whom are communicants, and possessing 2500 churches and 1000 school buildings. The British and Foreign Bible Society could not have started its wonderful career but for the Evangelicals, and its most enthusiastic supporters within the Anglican Church come from Evangelical parishes. God's ancient people are not forgotten, and the Jews' Society, otherwise called 'Church Missions to Jews,' has its agents in the East End of London, Poland, Palestine, and elsewhere; and our own countrymen abroad are catered for by the Colonial and Continental Church Society. Both Societies are definitely under Evangelical auspices. Although much of our strength has been expended on missionary enterprise and activity, the needs of our people at home have not been lost sight of or ignored, as testified by the Church Pastoral Aid Society, the standing witness to the Evangelical concern for the multitudes at home who know not Christ. Founded in 1836, this was the earliest Home Society in the field, and ever since its formation its object has been to collect funds to enable the incumbents of large and populous parishes to obtain assistant clergy and lay workers wherewith the work of God may be more efficiently carried out and accomplished. Its grand motto, 'Our country for Christ,' is the keynote of its policy, and amongst the four thousand Evangelical parishes in the Anglican Church, those who have been assisted by it can bear grateful testimony to its unfailing sympathy and generous support.

Glancing back at the past, the older Evangelicals were not afraid to make startling innovations. To them we owe practically the introduction of Sunday

[1] Mr. Cornish, in his *History of the English Church in the Nineteenth Century* (Macmillan & Co., London, 1910), Part I., p. 23, says of the older Evangelicals that they regarded whatever truth was important as already discovered, and loved truth less for its own sake than as an engine of salvation. Whatever criticisms may be passed upon us to-day we cannot plead guilty to belittling truth; it is an absolute value, and we are its servants, not its masters.

schools into our Church, and the revival of hymn-singing into public worship. Canon Ollard, in his learned and exhaustive essay on Confirmation, published last year, points out that from the Evangelicals 'came the first attempts to reform in the practice of confirmation in the nineteenth century.'[1] They also popularized the practice of open-air preaching, and in modern days of using laymen in the services of the Church, and women workers and deaconesses. Another novelty was the holding of services in unconsecrated buildings and theatres, due, in the first instance, to the influence of Anthony Ashley Cooper, Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury—an innovation described by Tait, then Bishop of London, as 'one of the best works that had been undertaken since he entered upon his office, and which led to the opening of cathedrals and other large churches to evening congregations.'[2]

We have had our great bishops, men like the late Dr. Ryle of Liverpool, and his successor, Dr. Chavasse, who has resigned his see, but happily is still with us, and the late Dr. Watts-Ditchfield, Bishop of Chelmsford, and saints such as Frances Ridley Havergal, William Pennefather, Bishop Handley Carr Glyn Moule, and Harry Grey, to single out merely a few from the very many who could be mentioned.

What about the future? Voices cry that our prospects in the Church of England look dark and gloomy. The alterations about to be made in the Prayer Book, though it would be truer to say that they will be additions, for we know that the old services will remain intact, may render our position untenable in our Church. Speaking for ourselves, we do not share that view; we have far more to fear from the dangers within than from those without. Provided that we live Christ, and preach Christ, and that the teaching of the Cross with all the amazing love and glory of Divine self-sacrifice bites deep into our inmost souls, the splendid history of Evangelicalism is not well-nigh run. Great days are in store for us. Meanwhile the words of Archbishop Benson, on being told of the possibility of an Evangelical secession, apply with as much force to the Anglican Church of to-day as to the period in which they were first uttered, 'Except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved.'

[1] *Confirmation*, by various Writers, vol. i. p. 219 (S.P.C.K., London).

[2] Cf. *Life of Archbishop Tait*, third edition, vol. i. p. 257.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Seeing in the Dark.[1]

'I will make darkness light before them.'—Is 42^{16}.

Are you one of those little souls that don't like the dark, who feel shuddery and eerie and just a wee bit frightened in it? And so you hate going to bed! You hang about, you put off, you make all kinds of excuses, you climb on Mother's knee, you ask a question and another—you have all kinds of tricks for gaining just a little longer time. And the real reason is that it's so friendly and safe in the bright room with all the others; and out in the passage, and going up the stair, it's so dark and lonesome, and your heart goes pit-a-pat, and you keep keeking back across your shoulder, for you feel something might jump out at you, and grab at you, and you feel all shivery inside. Once in the bedroom with the light lit, it's all right. But when it's out again, before you go to sleep, all kinds of fears come trooping back into your head. What's that? It's only a board creaking in the floor! No, nobody is treading on it. It's a way they have, that's all. And then you lie quite still, with your head covered. There is something: you can hear it plain and clear. Why, little silly, that's only your own eyelashes brushing against the sheets! In the dark, when everything is quiet, they can make such a noise! There's no need to be frightened. And half of you knows that and isn't a bit frightened, is big and grown up and brave, and talks down to the other bit of you that is timid and scarey and near calling out for some one.

Well, it seems clever men are learning to see in the night. They use a thing like a kind of wireless. If, before one end of it, there are people sitting in a room quite dark, then at the other end you can see what they do, can watch them yawning,

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

and nodding, and taking out a cigarette, and then a match, and lighting it; can see it all, though if you were in the room itself you would see only the red glow of the cigarette, and nothing more but blackness. They're teaching us how to see in the dark.

And if you could see in your bedroom, alone there in the night with your heart in your mouth, what would you see? Nothing at all. Because there's nothing there, except the bed and the chairs, and the dressing-table, and the other things, and you. It's stupid to be frightened about nothing!

And yet there is some one there. We'll never see Him, even with this queer new kind of wireless. Yet God is there, is always there, watching, and taking care of you, and loving you. Isn't it silly to be scared when you know that? If you were certain Dad was in the room, you wouldn't mind the dark. You wouldn't see him, and you mightn't hear him; but if you knew that he was there, you couldn't be frightened. For, of course, Dad would take care of you. And who takes care of Dad? Why God, of course. And if He's there with you, why then there's nothing to be frightened at; and He is.

There are some people who can see Him. Once a man in the Psalms was just dreadfully ill, and they thought that he might die; or some one that he loved was ill, his little lassie it may be, and people thought that that some one might die. And yet the man wasn't afraid. 'For thou art with me,' he said, looking up into God's face, and kind of snuggling happily up against Him. Yes; and there was another man in another Psalm who was in a city where every one was dreadfully frightened. For nearer and nearer came the line of fires where the enemy was burning farmhouses and villages; and in a little while these armies would be coiled chokingly round the little city's walls. And what will we do then? the others cried, gazing with terror in their eyes. But this man kept quite cool. 'God is very near,' he said, and took hold of His hand, quite unafraid. And once every one was streaming away from Jesus Christ, and leaving Him alone. 'No,' He said, 'not alone, for the Father is with Me.' 'Where?' asked the others, staring about them. They could see Nobody! Yet God was there. Yes, whenever there is a little one afraid in the dark, or at grips with a temptation, or with a hard bit of life to live, you mayn't see Him, and mayn't hear Him, and mayn't know that God is with you, but He is, quite near, the dear God who takes care of us.

How is it that wise men are helping us to see in the dark, like pussies? Well, I don't understand it. But a man who thinks he does, says it is like this. You know a piano has gruff notes at one end, and shrill notes at the other. But there are gruffer notes than the gruffest on the piano, and shriller notes than the highest we have there. There is no room for them in the piano, but they are just as really real as the notes that we can strike and sound. And so light is made up of a lot of rays—red and blue and other colours that, all mixed together, make up light. But while in a rainbow we can see the blue rays and the red rays, and some others, there are rays in it that we can't see, just as there are notes, real notes, that we can't sound on a piano. And what they are doing is to open our eyes a little wider so that we can use another ray we never used before. And that's how men are beginning to learn to see in the dark. Well, in the Bible there's a man who once asked God to do just that. 'Open mine eyes,' he said, 'that I, who can see all the usual things already, may see even more, things that are really there, though I don't notice them.' And, if we ask Him, God will open our eyes too, till we know He is there; and, knowing that, will never need to be afraid again.

The Little Brown Nest.[1]

A Parable for Easter-Tide.

High in the fork of an old apple tree a little brown nest had been built by a pair of grey thrushes. The nest was very proud of herself and loved the old apple tree that held her so tightly and kept her so safely even when the great storm winds blew. She was proud of the birds that had built her with so much skill and so much care, and had made her so strong on the outside that the rain could not get in nor the winds blow through, and had made her so soft on the inside that the tenderest of baby birds would never be hurt or even bruised, however the storms might beat the trees and sway them to and fro.

One by one the grey thrush laid three eggs, eggs so blue that they looked as though the shells were made out of the floor of heaven. 'Keep my eggs safe,' whispered the wise mother thrush, 'and one day you will have a most glad surprise.' After that the little brown nest was more proud of herself than ever, and always she was saying: 'I must be snug and warm and strong, and keep safe these

[1] By the Reverend William J. May, Ilkeston.

eggs the mother thrush has trusted me with, and some day there will be a glad surprise. I wonder what?'

But the bleak east wind heard the little nest talking to herself, and he laughed in his savage way. 'Surprise,' he laughed, 'there will be a surprise, there surely will, but there will be no gladness about it.' And he laughed again with a laugh that was a roar so loud that the little brown nest shook with fear and was afraid that she would be thrown down to the ground. Only the grey apple tree held her tightly. 'You must really be more careful,' the nest told the east wind, 'for I have something very precious that I am keeping here—jewel-boxes, the thrushes called them—and if you throw me down they will be broken.' The east wind laughed more loudly than ever. He knew that the little brown nest need have no fear, for she was too firmly fixed in the fork of the tree for any one to be able to throw her down. But he roared and blew with all his strength, hoping to make her afraid.

The east wind had to move on at last, and the little brown nest was happy again, for the grey thrush sat on the three blue eggs that were blue as the floor of heaven, and whispered to the nest of the great surprise that would come some day. 'Some day soon,' the grey thrush said.

The sun shone brightly and the south winds blew softly, and the grey thrush perched on a bough near the nest and sang lilting songs of spring-time loveliness and summer glory, and the grey old apple tree forgot that she was old and had seen many springs, and wore a spring-time dress all pink and white as she had done when she was very young. And one morning the thing most wonderful of which the grey thrush had been telling really happened. For the jewel-cases that were blue as the floor of heaven were empty, and there were three baby birds for the little brown nest to keep warm and to guard from the wind and the rain.

Oh, but the little birds were lots of trouble. All day long the happy grey thrushes were flying here and searching there, and looking for food for the hungry birds, and all day long the little birds were crying: 'We're hungry. We're very hungry. We're so very hungry we don't know what to do!' And all day long the wee brown nest had to keep the birds warm and guard them from the wind and the rain.

The days went by, and every day the birds were a little bigger than they were the day before, and their feathers began to grow, and they did not cry as much as they had done when they were younger. Soon they had grown so big that there was scarcely room for them all in the little brown nest. When they moved they squeezed each other's wings and trod upon one another's toes. At last a day came when the biggest of them could look over the edge of the nest when he stood on tiptoe. He could see the little green world of the apple tree and the blue sky that is like the floor of heaven. He wanted to go out into it, but he was afraid to leave the nest. One day he really did flutter off, and got as far as the branch below the fork of the tree. He had found his wings, and soon he learned to fly farther and farther away, and only now and then did he find his way back to the little brown nest. Sometimes the little nest was sad, missing the bird that had flown away. 'I still have the other two,' she told herself. But they grew only a little less slowly, and before many more days had come and gone they also had found their wings and learned to fly, and the little brown nest that had guarded and protected them saw them no more.

Once again the east wind blew across the orchard and found the little brown nest in the fork of the old apple tree, empty and cold. Once more he laughed in his savage way. 'Was I not right?' he said, 'the surprise came as the thrushes said. But what have you to show for it? Some bits of broken eggshell, blue as the floor of heaven, lying on the ground, and you are empty and deserted. And for all your sacrifice and care that is all you have to show.' The little brown nest laughed happily to herself. 'You do not know,' she said, 'You do not know the wonderful secret that is mine. Listen!' Far above them in the highest crown of the apple tree the thrushes' song rang out in a chorus so sweet and loud that men stopped their work and their talk to listen and to praise. 'That was my surprise,' the little brown nest said, 'the broken eggshells were only the jewel-cases, as the thrushes said; those birds are the jewels, and they are mine, though I share their music with the world.'

Hushed and quieted, the bleak east wind went on his way and said not another word.

There's an empty nest,
And grief unguessed,
And a lonely heart—no more?
There's a bird a-sing,
On a buoyant wing,
Soaring to Heaven's door.

The Christian Year.

Sunday Next before Easter.

Joy and Sacrifice.

'Looking unto Jesus, the author and perfecter of faith, who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God.'—He 12^2 (R.V.).

1. 'For the joy that was set before him.' This verse stands alone in the New Testament. At first sight it seems to attribute self-regarding motives to the supreme act of pure self-sacrificing love. Surely, we may protest, our Blessed Lord was not thinking of Himself when He hung upon the Cross. He did not console Himself by thinking of His return to heaven in triumph. He drank the bitter cup to the dregs in pure love for mankind, for us men and for our salvation.

Yes, that is true. But in the Epistle to the Hebrews, above all others, we need never be afraid that the note of heroism will be lowered. There is much more in this mention of 'joy' than meets the eye. Let us consider what the inspired writer meant when he speaks of joy as the motive of the Passion of Christ.

The great Indian poet and prophet, Tagore, whose writings are an inspiration to thousands in this country, speaks of joy—God's own joy—as the motive and cause of the creation of the world. Joy, he says, belongs inseparably to the act of creation. It is at once the motive of creation, and the experience which accompanies every creative act. This is profoundly true. Joy, for us, is the sense of active co-operation with the laws of God's world. It is, always, the glad feeling that we are, for the time at least, in harmony with the mind of God, that we are, in however small a degree, thinking God's thoughts after Him, and doing what He wishes to see being done. Joy is the spontaneous elevation of mind which rewards all good work.

And are we to suppose that the most glorious of all achievements, the redemption of mankind by the perfect Man, who alone could redeem it, gave no joy to its author? Must it not have been a joy transcending all other joys when our Redeemer felt that He could say to His Father, 'I have finished the work that thou gavest me to do,' or when at the moment of death He uttered the single triumphant word τετέλεσται, 'It is finished'?

2. Joy is very different from pleasure. In the text Christ is spoken of as the example of perfect faith; and His perfect faith is shown in perfect endurance. The writer has before his eyes the picture of a long-distance foot-race. The heroes of old, of whom he has been speaking, have run their race, but they look to us, from the spectator's seats, to show the same endurance. Not without us can they be made perfect; their work is incomplete unless we carry it on. Therefore, he says, let us not disappoint them, but let us cast off the wraps in which we wait the signal to start, and let us run our race with enduring courage. For, see! There is Jesus, who ran the course before us, visible in glory at the goal. He endured to the end, for the joy that was set before Him—the joy of the deed, the joy of painful endurance, for the sake of a victory that was worth all the pain.

Such a joy is far indeed from what we call pleasure. But is it not the truth that every really creative act, every worthy achievement, brings us as much pain as pleasure? In hard physical exertion the muscles are weary, the lungs pant, the heart labours. And if our work is intellectual, what pleasure is there in feeling all our nerves on edge, with waves of irritation and depression surging through us? But no great work can be done without paying this price. And still the joy is there—joy that makes all worth while.

'We can only,' says George Eliot in *Romola*, 'have the highest happiness, such as goes along with being a great man, by having wide thoughts and much feeling for the rest of the world; and this sort of happiness often brings so much pain with it that we can only tell it from pain by its being what we would choose before everything else, because our souls see it is good.'

3. Perhaps the deepest lesson of the Passion is that the acceptance of pain enters into the experience of God Himself. Homer spoke of his gods as they 'who lead an easy life'; we know that God does not lead an easy life. The harmony of the Divine life is a harmony which has overcome the harshest discords. The greater the work the greater the pain, and the greater the joy. If we can once get this truth firmly into our minds, that the perfect spiritual life is an experience in which pleasure and pain are both included, and taken up together into a higher realization, that which we call joy, it will alter our whole attitude towards the troubles of this world. There is no other way of understanding them; there is no other way of conquering them; and there is no other way of helping others to bear them. Hear the words which follow in this chapter. 'All chastening seemeth for the present to be not joyous but grievous; yet

afterward it yieldeth peaceable fruit unto them that have been exercised thereby, even the fruit of righteousness.'

For every true disciple, and much more for our Divine Captain Himself, the bitterest sorrow—that which is hardest to transmute into joy—is the sin and folly of mankind. This is indicated in the verse which follows the text, but it is unfortunately mistranslated in the Authorized Version. In the R.V. it reads, 'Consider him that hath endured such gainsaying of sinners against *themselves*,' not 'against himself.' The contradiction, the gainsaying of sinners against their own souls, was the bitterest grief that Christ had to endure.

This is a thought to touch the conscience of the most hardened sinner. It is also a strengthening thought when we are tempted to be 'weary and faint in our minds' at the desperate wickedness and folly which we see going on around us. The Cross of Christ can bear even that burden. Sin is sin, and for ever hateful; the wicked, when they die, will go to their own place, like Judas; but for those that love God, all things, even the crimes of the wicked, will work together for good; and those who have run their race with patience, sorrowful, yet always rejoicing, looking unto Jesus, the Captain and Perfecter of faith, will enter into the joy of their Lord, in whose presence is the fullness of joy. 'These things have I spoken unto you (our Lord said), that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full.' [1]

Easter Sunday.

The Gospel of the Resurrection.

'The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour.'—Ac $5^{30, 31}$.

The resurrection of Christ is the most challenging fact of history. It is a miracle of such tremendous quality that all the other miracles of the Gospel story pale beside it into insignificance. Time was when a preacher on Easter morning would have given himself to build up arguments for the truth of the Resurrection. And, indeed, there are many arguments which could be brought forward. There is the argument of the New Testament book. You cannot account for this book except by the fact of the resurrection of Christ from the dead. And there is the argument of the New Testament men. You cannot account for Peter and Paul—the difference between the men they were and the men they became—except by way of a miracle, and that miracle is the miracle of Christ risen. Their whole life and personality became what they were because their hearts were kindled by the vision of the risen Christ, as flame is caught from flame.

But there is not so much need to-day to argue for the Resurrection. The outlook of thinking men has widened. Scientific men used to argue against it. They used to close up the universe against the possibility of God and deny any value to spiritual experience outside their own explanation. They have given up this line of argument to-day. Life is far too wonderful a thing for any man to reduce it to a system and cry to faith, 'Hands off!'

What we ought to be concerned about most of all, then, to-day, is not the truth of the Resurrection fact, but the meaning of it. What tremendous power was it that lay behind it? What was it that was happening there in that sealed tomb from which Christ came forth at last, glorious in His risen life? The answer the Bible gives us, in phrase after phrase, is just this. It was a creative act of God. It was a new revelation of the living power of the living God. That, it says to us, is the kind of God with whom we have to do. We had learned something about Him before. We had learned that He is a God of righteousness, of purity, of truth—of righteousness and truth so unbending that Christ went to His Cross rather than yield one iota before the forces of the world. And we had learned that He is a God of love. That is the message of Calvary. But when Christ rose again we learned this, that this Spirit of righteousness and love is also the secret of power, able to unlock the gates of death, and turn the forces of Nature into an instrument of His Will. This is the final solution of the discussion we have been having these last years about might and right. Now we get it clear. They are both one in God. Might is right, and right is might, when you strike the fountain-head. In the last resort, love and righteousness are the only might, the only omnipotence. A spirit like that of Jesus holds the key to every prison-house of sin and suffering. He taps the resources of God by which every stronghold of evil which has mocked our puny science with its impassive walls is at last overthrown. When He steps into the world, a spiritual factor comes into play which changes the whole situation. Having dominion over sin through His fellowship with God, He had found the secret of dominion over disease and death. For when evil had done its worst and

[1] W. R. Inge, in *Lenten Sermons*, 95.

its storm and passion had gathered all its forces—social, military, political, ecclesiastical—to put Him to death, the Spirit of love and righteousness laid hold of that broken body in a stone-walled tomb and became triumphant and glorious in the risen Christ. 'Whom, therefore, they slew and hanged on a tree. Him God raised from the dead and exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour.'

Life would begin to blaze for us with all kinds of wonders if only we took time to steep our souls in such a vision of God as we find in the Resurrection of Jesus. Listen to the apostles as they look death in the face. Listen to what they say of it because they had seen the glory of God in the face of the risen Christ. He hath abolished death—made it of no account. For them there was no such thing any more. If they had gone to one of our churchyards to-day, or to the battlefields of Flanders, with all their 'teeming crosses, row on row,' what would they have said of it? Would they not have said what one of our mystics said of a certain city cemetery, when a friend remarked to him how full it was becoming, 'Full,' he said, 'it is the emptiest place in all England!' He hath abolished death.

But that did not nearly exhaust the meaning of the Resurrection for these disciples. They were more interested in life than in death. There is a kind of faith in the Resurrection which turns this life into a mere vestibule to eternity, a corridor to heaven. That was not the way in which the apostles looked at it. The Resurrection had a meaning for life, and it is this. It meant the possibility of a new life here and now, a risen life, a new quality of being. They saw how the Spirit of God had come forth into this broken body and had changed it and made of it somehow—all marred and wounded as it was—a vehicle of His Spirit. And they said to themselves: If this is the God with whom we have to do, this new creating God, who lives in the risen Christ, what manner of men is it not possible for us to be, what manner of life is it not possible for us to live, and what manner of things is it not possible for us to do, with such a Prince and Saviour! The world began to palpitate with all kinds of victorious possibilities. Life became romantic with adventure.

There are three great new hopes which rise from this Resurrection fact and meet us in our world to-day.

1. The first is a new hope for *the individual*, the hope of resurrection to a new quality of life. As the Spirit of God came into that wounded and broken body of Christ, cannot the Spirit of God come into our lives, all stained and broken as they are, and raise them to a new quality of being—make of them, indeed, a new creation?

Is it so strange after all? Is it so incredible? The genius of Michael Angelo can take a block of marble out of a scrap-heap, spoiled by a bungler and cast aside, and turn it into a masterpiece, working the very disfigurement into his design? Will the genius of God do less for men than that? Can He not take this nature of ours with all the stuff of daily toil and traffic, and make of it the medium of a finer life, a life radiant with power and peace, springing from man's inner fount of being, where Christ is enthroned as Prince and welcomed as Saviour. It is this new life, Christ-governed and Christ-created, for which the world is looking to us to-day.

2. In the second place, there is a message of hope for *the Church*. We remember what happened at Pentecost? Pentecost was the corresponding miracle in the Church to that which happened when God raised Christ from the dead. It was a resurrection. What was it that had happened? The Spirit which rose in Jesus had made of that humble company the vehicle of His life. The dominant note in their minds was an overwhelming and all-subduing consciousness of Christ as Lord, raising their whole nature to its highest level, in a response of victorious energies.

All that is possible again. It is the eternal possibility of such a God abroad in such a world as this. It is for that resurrection we are waiting. Meanwhile let us cast away all depressions and lift up hearts of hope. Let us take a new look at God, as He is revealed in the risen Christ, and the same response of faith will be awakened; for the faith which makes us mighty is no artificial creation of our own resolve. It is the natural response to the vision of God we see in the risen Jesus.

3. But can we not go even further and say that there is a message here of hope *for society*, for the social order, in which man is bound to man and nation to nation? Look back through history and what do you see? You see the Spirit of God, who is the Spirit of life, seeking some means of expression like an artist seeking paint and canvas. You see Him make man out of the clay to bear His image. You see Him take a race of slaves and nurse them into freedom and independence that they might reveal His mind and will to the world. You see Him coming into the world in Christ, revealing Himself and His glory in that life and death. You see Him taking new form for His

Spirit in the glorified body of the risen Christ. You see Him gathering the Church and kindling there the flame divine upon the altar of men's committed lives. Is it conceivable that it should all end there? Is it conceivable that the process should end before the whole social order in which man lives with man and nation with nation becomes a body for the Spirit of God? What does the Resurrection say to us looking on such a world as this? Does it not say that there is Power, power of infinite love and grace, able to enter this world and make it beautiful? There is power of love and goodwill, power of truth and brotherhood, by which society may be lifted out of its hatreds and conflicts into the ways of righteousness and peace. When we are at the end of our own resources we are only at the beginning of our resources in Him who was raised from the dead and exalted to become a Prince and a Saviour.[1]

First Sunday after Easter.

How to keep in the Way.

'This is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you.'—Jn 15^{12}.

1. The devotion to Christ, so glowing and fervent in men so different as Simeon and Pusey, has been transformed to-day into an intellectual interest and admiration of Christ as the most perfect human character rather than as a personal Saviour. And the new human interest in the Jesus of History has led many to look to Him as an Example rather than as their Redeemer to whom they owed everything. And so, many hardly know how to respond to such a direction as, 'Abide in my love.' And yet our Lord evidently attaches great importance to it. Happily He tells us how we may do it. 'As I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love, [so] if ye keep my commandments ye shall abide in my love.' And again, 'This is my commandment, That ye love one another.'

As we reflect we see how reasonable it is. We only learn an art or a virtue by practising it. If I wish to have some sense of an artist's power in painting, I must have some knowledge of drawing and colour, and the more I practise the fuller my appreciation. And so, if I am to know what love is, I must be a lover. There is no other way. The selfish son can never realize the unselfishness of his mother, nor the selfish wife the love of her husband. It is not possible. So Christ is only stating a universal law when He says: 'If ye keep my commandments, which are expressed in love, ye will abide in my love.' Judas never abode in Christ's love because he was governed by self-interest, always seeking his own ends. St. John, on the other hand, realized it more than any other because he had such a warm love for other people. And so the saints, like St. Francis of Assisi, St. François de Sales, St. Vincent de Paul, John Wesley, Bishop Patteson, who were all wonderful lovers of mankind, had also a remarkable sense of Christ's love for them. As they increased in loving, so their sense of being loved developed. It is this which explains such difficult expressions as 'Forgive us our sins, for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us,' which means, 'Give us a sense of forgiveness because we know by experience what forgiving means.' So again: 'He that loveth his brother abideth in the light'—*i.e.* he sees love; whilst on the other hand, 'He that loveth not abideth in death.' Again: 'He that loveth not knoweth not God'—*i.e.* has no experience of God. And why? for 'God is Love.' Or again: 'We have passed out of death into life because we love the brethren.' Love in action opens out all the faculties that can perceive Divine love.

It may perhaps be clearer if, taking for granted that our Lord is perfect love, a supposition none can deny, we believe Him to be radiating this love in every direction. He wants every one to believe in it. As the Bible says: 'It is over all His creatures.' He is ever seeking to transfer His thought of it to our minds. But transference of thought, as we now know, is limited by the nature of the person to whom it would transfer itself.

2. Let us inquire what this love of others means, and how it shows itself. Our Lord explains it for us in the words that follow. They are gathered out of His own experience, and show the way in which He loved, for He is our Example. 'This is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you.'

(1) *Breadth.*—There was *no narrowness* in His love. The general principles are gathered from such teaching as, 'If ye love them which love you, what thank have ye? Do not even the publicans the same?' 'Which of these three, thinkest thou, proved neighbour unto him that fell among thieves? And he said, He that showed mercy on him. And Jesus said, Go, and do thou likewise.' These show that His love was as wide as humanity itself. It made no distinction. Rich, poor, Samaritan, Roman, Jew, all came within the embrace of His love. They were all neighbours, all the children of His Father, all cared for.

[1] J. Reid, *The Victory of God*, 12.

St. Francis embracing the leper, Bishop Patteson with his arms around his beloved Melanesian boys, Mary Slessor bursting with affection for her African sisters, are not isolated pictures. They have learnt to love the whole world, poor and rich, ignorant and wise, educated and uneducated. Do we ask what thank have they? They have learnt by experience the width of Christ's love and know in their own love to others what a Lover He is to themselves.

(2) *Self-sacrifice.*—Perhaps no words have been more frequently quoted or emblazoned on memorial tablets and monuments than those quoted here: 'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.' If they seem impossible to us who read them, they were judged possible and actual for those thousands, whom we commemorate in all lands, who left home and everything that they might bring liberty to those who were oppressed. Yes, but war is a call. How can we feel the same emotion now it is over? How can we recover the same high purpose and be stirred by the same spirit of self-sacrifice? There is only one way, and that is by regarding the world as Christ did. To Him it represented the same features of oppression and high-handed tyranny that we saw in Belgium. 'I am come,' He said, 'to change all that, to proclaim deliverance to the captives and liberty to them that are bruised. I am come to give the oil of joy for ashes and the spirit of praise for the garment of heaviness.' And so He called His friends about Him and told them to go out everywhere and tell of their freedom. Liberty was His gospel.

Still the appeal goes forth. From the dark continent of Africa there comes the cry for deliverance from the bondage of fear. And from India there is even a louder and more imperative cry from the twenty millions of child widows who, from no fault of their own, are made the despised drudges, of their families. But, besides all this, there are nearer needs than those which are so evident in heathen lands. There are the slaves of drink, lust, and convention — men and women who are bound by fetters more galling and more difficult to break than the chains found in the slave gang; they, too, are waiting deliverance, and it rests upon those who know the love of Christ and believe in His power to take their part in giving them freedom. If we make an effort to do this, Christ's love, as He sees our endeavour, presses out to us.

(3) *Friendship.*—'I have called you friends.' It is not only pity for the condition of the world that leads man to follow Christ in His great adventure, but the sense of friendship. 'We are doing this for our friends'—that was the spirit of the war. To love as our Lord did is to help forward personally or through others the education and development of all those whom He has emancipated. There is no greater work than this, and none that inspires more joy. The consequences we leave in His hands whose school it is. 'I may not see the results,' said General Armstrong, who did more to educate and uplift the negroes of the Southern States than any other; 'but the fun of life is in action, not results.'

(4) *Disinterestedness.*—Christ's love differs as much from ordinary love in its disinterestedness as in its friendliness and unselfishness. Immensely great as the redemption of the world was, our Lord would never sacrifice the character of His workers for it. He states His aim by saying first: 'Ye did not choose me, but I chose you'—*i.e.* 'It was not because you came flocking round me that I put you into my work, because you showed inclination, interest, or desire for my service, but because I loved you and wanted to make something of you. I appointed you that you should bear fruit and that your fruit should abide.'

With many ardent workers there is often jealousy lest those who are working under them should show gifts and powers superior to their own. Great leaders will sometimes prefer to have associated with them followers of a distinctly lower power than themselves. They are probably quite unconscious of it, but in Christ's eyes it is a fatal disparagement of their work. They have failed to catch His spirit, which ever regarded the development of His associates as His first aim.

Now this is a rough sketch of the kind of way in which Christ would have us obey His commands and so abide in His love. There is no question that in so doing we know and feel Christ's love to ourselves. The sacrifice it entails reveals His sacrifice; the patience it involves makes us realize something of His patience; the thought it demands speaks of His thoughtfulness. We know He is infinitely more to us than we are to those we try to help, and so by our very efforts we realize His relationship. And the sense of His love to us which we learn in that way reacts upon our life of service. So we get joy every way. Joy from His thought of us, and joy from the ever-increasing companionship which service reveals.[1]

[1] G. H. S. Walpole, *The Undiscovered Country and the Way to It*, 134.

Second Sunday after Easter.

Thomas.

'The other disciples therefore said unto him, We have seen the Lord. But he said unto them, Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe.'—Jn 20^{25}.

There is a statue of St. Thomas by the great sculptor, Thorwaldsen. It shows a man grave and thoughtful in mien and bearing; in his hand he carries a measuring-line. Something very like that figure Thomas must have been; it makes satisfyingly complete the fragmentary segments of the character revealed in the Gospels. Certainly the measuring-line is correct. No device carried by any of the saints, as art portrays them, is more apposite than that measuring-line. In religion Thomas was a measurer, not a mystic; not a lyrical, but a logical spirit. Of him are Longfellow's lines true and exact:

> We have not wings, we cannot soar;
> But we have feet to scale and climb
> By slow degrees, by more and more.

It is in the Fourth Gospel that we find the material for a character-study of Thomas. Very precious to us are those passages which the Holy Spirit moved St. John to inscribe in his Gospel, so that St. Thomas should emerge from the shadows that beset him elsewhere, and with brotherly hand and understanding heart guide and support his brethren to-day. One is the passage in which Thomas 'the doubter' volunteered for service when those of an ampler faith hung back. Another is the passage in which Thomas broke out with his frank confession of dubiety and ignorance of the doctrine of Christ. The third is the moving episode, which St. John preserves in this twentieth chapter, of St. Thomas's abrupt and tenacious doubt of the Redeemer's Resurrection life.

1. *His Loyalty and Courage.*—There is first the incident that occurred on the way to Bethany, where Lazarus had died. The apostolic band hung back. They sensed danger ahead; it might be death for themselves. Peter hung back; that robust and evangelical believer did not like the look of it. John hung back; the mystical and ecstatic believer did not feel easy about the venture into that perilous country ahead. But Thomas stood forward to go. It was Thomas, the critical disciple, who could reason out and weigh the danger most surely of them all, who advanced to his Leader and, turning on the others, cried, 'Come along, we will die with Him.'

There is courage and cold, firm vigour in that act. There are men and women who lack the soaring faith and buoyant expression of it that others have that yet are seen in the forefront of forlorn hopes and enduring the brunt of the ding-dong war. Not for them the joy mystical, nor the trumpeting confidence of those who have no doubt at all of the manifestation of God among men; they are but feeling their way after this mysterious Nazarene. They cannot explore the resplendent titles the Church has inscribed above Him; they are puzzled by Paul; they are mazed by John; they feel at a loss almost anywhere in the New Testament except in the Sermon on the Mount, where Christ speaks 'plainly' as to men who have to foot out the miles, and climb the hills, albeit the peaks seem inaccessible. Christ as their teacher! No more. But all that is in them is in the grip of it, and into all they do they put it all!

2. *His Honesty.*—Again, let us thank St. John for revealing Thomas to us as unafraid of confessing his ignorance of the meaning of Christ's own doctrine. Christ said: I am going home to prepare a place for you, and whither I go, ye know, and the way ye know.' Thomas saith unto him, 'Lord, we know not whither thou goest, and how can we know the way?' As like as not the others shared the ignorance of Thomas, but they had not his unfearing and straightforward mind.

Consider the good guidance and the good cheer this episode affords. He is a bold man among us who says he sees all plain in the engagement of Providence with the sons of earth. In many instances, this is our secret, unrevealed to any. But sometimes we utter it. We confess aloud that we are at a loss with God and His Christ. What is to be done? The temptation is to slur the problem for the man who speaks with Thomas's speech, to try to mollify the interrogation of Thomas with customary generalities about the woe (bereavement, failure, or other mysterious dispensations) being 'God's will,' 'the hand of God's hidden love,' or the like.

There is only one thing to do. Go down on our knees and make our complaint to Christ Himself. Challenge Him with the vexation of our soul. Behind our closed eyelids view the Son of God as He sits on the hill of Beatitudes and speaks; again, as He stoops in the Garden, shrinking from the 'cup,' and then claiming it back from the hand of God His Father; again, as He hangs upon the

Cross, crying of dereliction, and then recovering His soul as He resigns Himself to the hands of God in the dark; again, as He mounts on Olivet in the radiance of His celestial body, and says, 'Lo, I am with you alway, to the end of the world.' So set ourselves before Christ, and lay our woe or our perplexity before Him, measure by measure, mood by mood. Before we have made our count complete, a Spirit will so have come upon our spirit, that we shall say no more! A mightier thing shall have come to us than a logical plan of the problems which entangled us.

It is as though I were told by one of whom I asked my path over the hills and far away, 'There is a map of sorts of that country, but you shall have to make your own survey'; while another said, 'I have been there, and I will go with you.' That wayfarer is Christ. Nay, He is more than that! He is what He avowed Himself to Thomas: *Himself the Way.*

3. *His Doubt.*—On Easter Day, when Jesus appeared to the disciples, Thomas was not with his colleagues; during the week they sought him out, and told him what had occurred. Thomas, however, bluntly replied: 'Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe.' That was the kind of man Thomas was. His was the logical type of mind. He wanted hard facts. But it is often forgotten that neither did the others believe without evidence. How did Mary Magdalene believe? Did she believe without convincing evidence? No. On her way to the grave in the early morning, Mary, like the other women, expected to find our Lord's body; then, when she found that the tomb was empty, she assumed that the body had been removed; and Mary did not believe that Jesus had risen until she recognized something familiar in the tone of His voice. Again, take the case of the two disciples on the road to Emmaus. Did they believe without convincing evidence? No. On the road they took Jesus to be a stranger; not even His discourse on prophecy was enough to open their eyes; and the Lord rebuked them for their unbelief. Again, take the case of the ten disciples. Did they accept the testimony of others? No. They dismissed the women's story as an 'idle tale.'

But, true though that is, there were two special hindrances to Thomas's belief in the reappearing of his Lord.

(1) The first was that mind of his that desired connected reasonings, visible and traceable as are the veins and muscles of the organized body. When he was told that Jesus Christ had gone forth from that tight tomb, his mind stiffened and drew back as a man might on the verge of a fluent quagmire. 'Risen?' he asked: 'from what, as what, to what?' He ran the question through all the categories by which his mind was regulated, and found none fit it.

Many a mind in our own day is set in this mould, and Easter for them is obscured and blocked by the incredibility of a dead body's rising from the swathed and frigid grave. But this is to miss nine-tenths of the evidence. It is to remain deaf and blind to St. Paul's corroboration of the chief complaint; for, said he, 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.' It is to pass by that resurrection of the Apostles' confidence, their resurgent zeal and triumphant activity, which leap up like flaming wings at the point where the narrative has sunk to ashes. It blinks the unmistakable statements that the Lord Christ appeared in such a form that the environment of space and matter was somehow transcended. 'The reality of which His resurrection assures us is not that of this life, but of another life transcending this.'

But let it be said again, the reality of this Resurrection is something other than can be resolved by a machine that registers the weight of a man's body, or by a measuring-line, of which one end is laid in a grave and the other extended into the immaterial realm. The fire of Pentecost fuses such a machine and leaves its register incapable. Life can only be explained by life; the life that so surged in Peter and the Eleven, that they emerged from their renegade disloyalty and cowardice to fill the city square with the trumpets of a new kingdom, has one explanation, and one only, and that is a Life of God which could not be holden of death.

(2) Thomas hindered himself in the belief in the reappearing of his Lord by forsaking the company of his fellow-disciples in the time of silence and seeming dereliction; and because he so forsook their patient and mutual assembly, the revelation of the risen Christ passed him by.

There is a message here from the experience of St. Thomas of old! If the doubter hies him from the company in which he formerly met with Christ, he turns his back on the way by which Christ returns! Abide by the Company! However uninspired it may now appear, however arid its forms and ceremonies, however savourless the hymns, however vacant its homilies. But let a man put himself under orders to maintain his place in the muster,

above all, to drive through his hard and inflexible thoughts with the ploughshare of prayer, and, as the minister who leads the worship prays, say, 'This is *my* prayer; I insist that it is my prayer!' Remember what Francis of Sales says in one place of 'spiritual dryness': 'Blessed Angela de Foligno says that the prayer which is most acceptable to God is that which we make by force and constraint, the prayer to which we apply ourselves not for any relish we find in it, nor by inclination, but purely to please God; to which our will carries us against our inclinations, violently forcing its way through the midst of the dryness and repugnance which oppose it.'[1]

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

The Lamb of God.

'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.'—Jn 1^{29}.

For many years before John the Baptist came preaching in the wilderness of Judæa the term 'Lamb' had been widely used in Jewish circles as a description of the promised and expected Messiah; it is found, not only in the Old Testament, but also in other Jewish books; and from these books it passed into the New Testament. First, John the Baptist applied it to Christ; secondly, St. Peter used it, not only in his speech at Jerusalem, but also in his first Epistle, where he calls Jesus 'the Lamb without blemish and without spot'; thirdly, John the Seer uses it twenty-nine times in his Revelation; and, putting all these passages together, and comparing them carefully with each other, we find that the term 'lamb' symbolizes, not meekness and gentleness, but three entirely different ideas. First, it was a symbol of power; secondly, it was a symbol of knowledge; and, thirdly, it was a symbol of sacrifice.

1. *The Lamb as a Symbol of Power.*—In the past, scholars have generally hesitated between two kindredi deas. Some, for example Dean Alford, thought that John was referring to Isaiah's famous description of the suffering servant, 'He is led as a lamb to the slaughter.' In this passage the leading idea is that the Messiah—or, perhaps, as some scholars think, the Jewish nation—will be a meek and gentle sufferer; and John, therefore, meant to indicate that, just as the lamb is led meekly to the slaughter, so Jesus, submitting to the will of God, would allow Himself to be crucified. Others, however, for example Marcus Dods, hold a slightly different opinion. John, they say, was thinking about the Old Testament sacrificial system; he was thinking either of the paschal lamb or of the lamb offered daily at the morning and evening sacrifice; and John, therefore, they think, was teaching the doctrine that, just as the lamb in the Jewish ritual was supposed to bear the sins of the people, so our Lord, on Good Friday, bore our sins in His own body on the tree.

In *The Days of His Flesh*, David Smith combines these two ideas. John, he says, conceived of the Messiah 'as a sin-bearer, led like a lamb to the slaughter.' For two reasons, however, this interpretation is improbable. First, there is no other indication that John considered meekness a great virtue; and secondly, there is no other indication that he predicted the Crucifixion. No such ideas are found in his sermons as reported by the Synoptists. In those sermons John describes our Lord, not as a sufferer, but as a conqueror. 'He,' said John, 'has the winnowing fan in His hand. He will separate the good from the evil; He will gather the wheat into His garner, and burn the chaff with unquenchable fire; He will baptize with the Holy Spirit and with fire.' In all these phrases the leading conception is power; and that is also the leading conception in the title 'Lamb of God.' By calling Jesus the Lamb of God, John meant, first and foremost, that Jesus would possess Divine power.

In order to understand the whole situation, we must remember that, in addition to the Old Testament, the Jews, in the time of Christ, read many other popular books; among these were 'The Secrets of Enoch,' 'The Testimony of Joseph,' and 'The Testimony of the Twelve Patriarchs'; and the point for us to notice is that in these books the term 'lamb' is generally used to describe, not a meek sufferer bearing the sins of others, but some great military hero or conqueror. David, who slew Goliath, is called a lamb; Judas Maccabæus, the hammer, is called a lamb; John Hyrcanus, the patriotic leader of a forlorn hope, is called a lamb; and so much was this last hero admired that many regarded him as the Messiah. We come here to a most remarkable fact. With us the lamb is a symbol of meekness. With the Jews, however, the term 'lamb' symbolized, not meekness, but power. In order to make the meaning perfectly clear, they described some of the leaders as possessing horns; Judas Maccabæus, for example, is called a lamb with a great horn; in the Book of Enoch the Maccabæan

[1] A. Boyd Scott, *The Twelve Take Stock of Us*, 86.

leaders are described as 'horned lambs'; and, finally, in the Book of Revelation, John calls our Lord Himself the 'Lamb with seven horns,' meaning that He is the omnipotent monarch. What, then, did John the Baptist mean when he called Jesus 'the Lamb of God'? He meant that Jesus would be the triumphant Messiah. Jesus, he says, will be far greater than David; Jesus will be a greater leader than Judas Maccabæus; Jesus will overcome all the forces of evil.

2. *The Lamb as a Symbol of Wisdom.*—In addition to possessing seven horns—the symbol of perfect power—the Lamb also possesses seven eyes. As the horn is the symbol of power, so the eye is the symbol of wisdom and knowledge; and, therefore, when St. John says that Christ possesses seven eyes, he means, not only that He is a Divine teacher, possessing a perfect knowledge of God and of His holy will, but also that He understands all the mysteries of the universe, and can even see into the future. Once more St. John is expanding an old Jewish idea. According to the prophet Isaiah, the Messiah would be filled with the spirit of wisdom and understanding; the term 'lamb' was applied by the Jews both to the prophet Samuel and to Solomon; even the woman of Samaria expected that the Messiah would be able to tell all things; and, therefore, when John the Baptist described Jesus as the Lamb of God, he probably meant to indicate that He would possess supernatural knowledge. But John the Seer, in Revelation, means much more than this. He means that the knowledge and wisdom possessed by the Lamb are exactly the same as the knowledge and wisdom possessed by God. The phrase about the seven eyes is borrowed from the Old Testament. In Zec 4^{10} we read about the seven eyes of the Lord that 'run to and fro through the whole earth.' What does Zechariah mean when he says that God has seven eyes? He means that God is omniscient. What, then, does St. John mean when he says that the Lamb has seven eyes? He means that the risen and ascended Christ is omniscient.

3. *The Lamb as a Symbol of Sacrifice.*—By what means, it may be asked, did Jesus become possessed of His omnipotence and omniscience?

According to the author of the Book of Revelation, Jesus became all-powerful and all-wise, not by means of physical force, and not even by means of strenuous intellectual endeavour, but by means of His life and death of perfect love, perfect sacrifice, perfect surrender, perfect devotion to the good of others. Love and surrender made Him all-powerful; love and surrender made Him all-wise. But what, it may be asked, does St. John mean when he says that the Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world? (Rev 13^{8}). He means that love and self-surrender are an essential and eternal element in the nature of God the Father. On the field of human history that love was manifested specially on Good Friday; in reality it existed from the beginning. Love, he says, can manifest itself only by means of sacrifice; love can only prove its existence by the willingness to suffer for others; love, therefore, from the beginning, designed both the Incarnation and the Cross.

How does the Lamb take away Sin? To this question there is only one answer of much practical value. Let us return to the meaning of 'Lamb of God,' and note the fundamental distinction between the principles of Jesus and the principles of modern society. In modern society man seeks power by means of force and cunning; Jesus gained His power by revealing the truth about God to men, and by living and dying on their behalf. And Jesus saves us from our sins by inspiring us with His own spirit, and conforming us to His own image. As long as a man seeks power by mere force and cunning, he is an enemy both of God and of man; and only by seeking the truth and serving others is any man entitled to gain power. Truth and love are the two greatest things in the world; truth and love are what humanity needs; truth and love are the only genuine passports to power. In her sketch of Dr. James Hinton, author of *The Mystery of Pain*, Mrs. Havelock Ellis says that early in life he made a profound discovery. He discovered that he could never be happy unless he gave his mind to the search for truth and his life to the service of others. Each evening, in his study, he tried to discover the truth; each morning, on his rounds, he was serving others; and thus he became a great and good power. Let us take Dr. Hinton as an example; and what happened in his case may also happen with us. By searching for the truth, and by living for others, he, aided by the Holy Spirit, became a practical mystic; and practical mystics are the men most needed in these critical days. Dedicate thy mind to the search for truth; dedicate thy life to the service of others; and God Himself will make thee a follower of the Lamb of God.[1]

[1] J. E. Hutton, *The Downfall of Satan*, 145.

Baha'ism and Christianity; or, The Religion of 'The Splendour of God.'

By the Reverend T. Crouther Gordon, D.F.C., B.D., Pitlochry.

One night, not very long ago, I was walking along a street in Haifa, and the glory of the Eastern night was shining down, when, lifting my eyes to the heights of Carmel, a clear white light shone forth from high up the side of the mountain. It was an exceptionally brilliant electric lamp, fixed on top of a flat building, and the beam shot across the Bay of Akka, and met half-way the light that streamed from a house on the outskirts of Akka. The first light was streaming from the Tomb of Abdu'l-Baha'. The second shone from the Prison and Tomb of his father, Baha'u'llah. Out of the star-spangled sky the light burst forth through the dim darkness, and in like manner, out of the gloom of the grovelling Arab life, out of the blankness of Syrian thought, dawns forth the faith of 'The Splendour of God.' For here in Haifa is the centre of a new 'ism.' Slowly but surely the number of the Baha'is is increasing, and in Persia and America and in Britain the followers of this new faith can be numbered by the million. It is worth while for men who are interested in religion to pay some attention to the movement.

Who was the founder of this new faith? Strange to say, it began with all the portents of a fresh Christianity. It had a John the Baptist. Mirza Ali Mohammed, a youth of twenty-four, began to announce in 1844 in Persia that he was the 'Bab,' or Gate, that prepared the way for a still greater prophet from God. This greater spirit would bring in the new era that was about to dawn. And yet so very narrow were the Muslims of Persia, that the hand of persecution never left the Bab; and, though he proclaimed a spirit of love and union and righteousness, he came to a martyr's death in Tabriz in 1850. Like the fiery John, his course was short and sharp and rough, but he left his greater spirit among his disciples.

The 'Splendour,' in fact, was two years older than his forerunner. He had the best blood of Persia coursing in his veins, but it was now mellowed and matured into the spirit of the liberal heart. But liberal heart or no, he soon entered the valley of malice, and suffered for what he believed to be right. His life in Teheran was made insupportable, and with some followers he was removed to Baghdad. Like Christ he found a long time in the soothing silence of the desert an urgent need. Returning to Baghdad after two years, so charged was his soul with wisdom and grace that the old city was stirred, and to avoid turmoil the King of Persia had to arrange his transference to Constantinople. This was in 1863. On the outskirts of Baghdad was a beautiful garden, the pride of Najib Pasha, and here the 'Splendour' lingered for some days till his caravan was ready, and here he cheered his dejected followers by the news that he himself and none other was the 'Baha'u'llah,' 'The Splendour of God.' It is typical of the new spirit that such glad words should fall on men's ears in the glory and beauty of a garden. Somehow one feels the grace and charm of the new era coming down through the flowers. Visit the tombs of both the great leaders and the scent of pure white blossoms carries to the brain the fragrance of Paradise. It cannot be other. It is the ethos of the faith. And it is very alluring. But there in that sweet Persian garden the departing exile struck joy and fervour into drooping hearts. The secret was told that 'The Splendour of God' was treading the soil of our common earth, and his men felt it good to be alive.

So across the desert to Europe he was taken, but even in Europe the power of a holy life was too much to combat, and at last a safe and secluded prison was found in Akka. From 1868 till his death this caged spirit made his prison a very paradise, for men came to him from all parts and sat at his feet for the soothing of his words and the sublimity of his faith. Yet still the dogged spirit of the world hunted him down, and he and his kind had few comforts about them. But finally it sunk upon even the spirit of bigotry that no danger lurked here, and he was allowed to live in a house on the outskirts of Akka, and there in the shade of trees he lived, and still lies there in his silent tomb. Treading on borrowed ground, for he had passed the allotted span of threescore years and ten, he died in 1892, leaving behind him no less than half a million hearts that gave him full allegiance.

But if he was different from the Christ in living to a good round age, he was different also in leaving behind him a son who carried on the spirit of the message. His son took the title of 'The Servant

of the Splendour,' and, armed with the full credentials of deputed authority and intimate experience of the leadership, he never wavered from carrying on the teaching of his father, and he spread the cause by repeated visits to Europe and America. He claimed the full authority of his father, and he alone was able to interpret his writings when any doubt arose. But there was no arrogance in the son. Even more than the father, he showed that grace and charm, that breadth of sympathy and deep human love that went to the utmost limit in the service of the world. At first some disappointed sycophants brought false charges against him, and induced the Turkish Government to restrict his liberty, but by 1908 he was again a free man. By 1911 he had addressed large audiences in London and Paris, and in the following year he was putting the claims of the new faith before American hearers, ever stressing the alluring ethic, and screening the dogmatic side of the religion in the beautiful mysticism of Oriental language. Then came the War, and, though a Muslim of the Shi'ah sect, he wrought hard to cultivate the land about Tiberias. In this way he saved many from starvation. His life during these days was one constant effort after the welfare of others, and so unselfish were his motives, so potent his influence for good, that he was honoured with a Knighthood of the British Empire. His death in 1921 evoked tokens of universal admiration.

And again, the movement is not without its leader, for the eldest grandson of the 'Servant of the Splendour' is the acknowledged head of the new faith, and to-day is propagating its tenets with undiminished zeal.

But what are these tenets? What new revelation has this prophet given? What fresh conception of God has he flung forth out of the travail of his spiritual strife? Coming as the new faith does out of the heart of Islam, it is not surprising that it lays down the Unity of God as its primal tenet. There is One God. But what is more interesting is the other tenet that there is only one religion. Each religious leader has taught his faith to meet the needs of his age, but at bottom all religions are the same. There is and can be only one religion. The differences in religion are explained by the peculiar needs of each age, and every religion has done something to lift humanity. And because we are moving from age to age, and because truth is infinite, there can be no final revelation. Religion consists in revering all the prophets. In his last Will and Testament the Founder says of religions, 'Lo! All are of God.' There is a third unity that lies at the basis of Baha'ism, and completes it, and it is the Unity of Mankind. We are all brothers. 'Glory is not his who loves his country, but his who loves his kind.' 'Ye must be as one soul in many bodies,' says the Founder in another place. Not only are men brothers one of another, but men and women are equal. There is no superiority of men over women in this new faith. And this, viewed, as it ought to be, in the Muslim background, is a very bold tenet to hold. I remember having a conversation with Madame Jellal, the sister of the present leader, Shoghi Effendi, one lovely summer morning in her house in Haifa. We two were the only ones in the room, and we spoke without reserve of the points of the faith, she without her Muslim veil, and I with uncovered head. It was a daring thing for her to do in the midst of so many fanatical Muslims. But it was a tenet of her faith. The unity of mankind deals the death-blow to all prejudices, religious, racial, and class. 'The ignorant one is not to be despised because he lacks knowledge. He must be trained, treated, educated, and assisted in love.'

Although there is a strong appeal in Baha'ism to the finer emotions, there is likewise an appeal to the higher intelligence. The search after Truth is imperative. Faith is good, but it must have reason as its other wing, for only thus can the bird of humanity fly. 'It cannot fly with one wing alone. If it tries to fly with the one wing of religion alone, it will land in the slough of superstition, and if it tries to fly with the wing of science alone, it will end in the dreary bog of materialism.' And just because of this sweep of the intellect the Founder of the faith saw far into the international problems that were arising. He openly proclaimed the need for a League of Nations, and he clamoured insistently for an international language such as Esperanto. The training of the intellect, he preached, was of prime importance, not so much in science and the arts as in the facts and messages of the prophets, for the prophets are 'the greatest educators of mankind.' Baha'u'llah says in his Tablet of Tajalliyat, 'To acquire knowledge is incumbent upon all, but of those sciences which may profit the people of the earth, and not such as begin in mere words, and end in mere words.'

A message too lies in Baha'ism for the modern world of industry. The old pagan doctrine of '*laborare est orare*' is revived. Work is a religious duty. 'The Servant of the Splendour' says: 'In the Baha'i cause arts, sciences, and all crafts are counted as worship. The man who makes

a piece of notepaper to the best of his ability, conscientiously, concentrating all his forces on perfecting it, is giving praise to God. Leaving aside the question of whether this is new or old, no one can dispute that the message is needed. Another theme in industry was touched on by Abdu'l-Baha, when he visited Paris. 'The arrangements of the circumstances of the people must be such that poverty will disappear. We see amongst us men who are overburdened with riches on the one hand, and on the other those unfortunate ones who starve with nothing. This condition of affairs is wrong and must be remedied. . . . The rich must give of their abundance; they must soften their hearts and cultivate a passionate intelligence, taking thought for those sad ones who are suffering from lack of the very necessities of life.' In America he made a strong appeal for the Abolition of Industrial Slavery. Arbitration is the secret.

And yet this new form of the world religion, attentive as it is to the needs of the modern world, remains true to the deepest religious temper, for on no point is it more insistent than that of holiness. The one need of man is devotion to God. The full impetus of Persian mysticism is felt in all the classics of the Baha'i faith. In his Words of Wisdom, the Founder says:

'The source of all good is trust in God, submission to His command, and contentment with His Holy Will and Pleasure.

'The essence of religion is to testify to that which the Lord hath revealed, and follow that which He hath ordained in His mighty Book.

'The essence of love is for man to turn his heart to the Beloved One and sever himself from all else but Him, and desire naught save that which is the desire of his Lord.'

It is clearly represented that God was revealing new truth through the Founder and his son, and the works which he has left are evidence of God's will. While the Baha was in Baghdad in A.D. 1857, there was revealed to him from God the book of 'Hidden Words.' The purest mysticism comes out in the following quotations:

'In My love is thy happiness, and in communion with Me is thy paradise.'

'If My will thou seekest regard not thine own, so shalt thou die in Me, and I live in thee.'

'Wert thou to run through the wilderness of Infinity, and speed throughout the plains of Heavens, thou shalt find no rest save in obedience to Our command and humbleness before Our Face.'

'The sincere lover longs for suffering, even as the rebel craves for forgiveness, and the sinner prays for mercy.'

'Hast thou ever heard of the Beloved and the stranger dwelling in the same heart? Then send away the stranger that the Beloved may enter into His abode.'

The machinery of the revelations is interesting. The messages that came to the prophet were read from Tablets 'preserved behind the veil of divine protection.' There is continually throughout the writings the use of the plural of majesty, which is one of the features of the Koran itself. And ever and again, to one who knows the original of the Koran, there is a kind of conscious imitation. Little wonder that the orthodox Muslim refused to tolerate such revelations. But whether the machinery is like that of the Koran or not, we ought not to blind ourselves to the very pure religion that breathes through each thought of the leaders of Baha'ism. It must rank as the highest expression of true faith that has emerged from the crass kernel of Islam.

The Baha, however, was a prophet in the most dangerous sense of the term. He did actually foretell events. A new age is dawning. He believed not only that

> Each age is an age that is dying
> Or one that is coming to birth,

but that we are standing on the threshold of a new stage in the life of humanity. Interpreting his father's prophecy, the Abdu'l-Baha says:

'In this marvellous cycle the earth will be transformed and humanity arrayed in peace and beauty. Disputes, quarrels, and murders will be replaced by harmony, truth, and concord; among the nations . . . love and amity will appear. Universal peace will raise its tent in the centre of the earth. Strong and weak, rich and poor, antagonistic sects and hostile nations, which are like the wolf and the lamb . . . will act toward each other with the most complete love, friendship, justice, and fairness. The world will be filled with science, with the knowledge of the reality of the mysteries of beings, and with the knowledge of God.'

It would be foolish to deny that this new faith has many merits. It would be unwise to shut our ears to its message for our age. It has a sweet morality, and uses no special propaganda. It has won many adherents through the power of its ethic alone, and it provides the atmosphere for fine spiritual culture. But sooner or later one must solve the problem, or at least try to solve it, of the relation of this Baha'ism to the Christian faith, and Dr. Esslemont has made a powerful plea for the claims of Baha'ism upon all earnest Chris-

tians. From an examination of the New Testament he lays down the three positions:

1. That Christians ought to expect the advent of further prophets, both true and false.
2. That it is incumbent upon Christians to examine the claim of any one professing prophethood, applying the simple but searching tests laid down by Jesus and John.
3. That if a prophet meets these tests satisfactorily, and thus proves his claim, it is a Christian duty to turn to him, accept his message and obey his instructions.

The first proposition is arrived at by the twofold method of showing, on the one hand, the awfulness of treating Baha' as the Jews treated Christ, and, on the other hand, by giving a favourable meaning to certain sayings of Christ. It would be a very easy matter to show that Jesus claims for Himself a unique and unparalleled position as the Son of God. According to the New Testament, He was 'only begotten.' But more than this, the heart of the gospel is that it meets every need in the human heart. Christ satisfies completely. That is what has made Christianity so confident. And to say that Christians must always be looking for further word from God is to say that Jesus Christ has left something undone. Christian experience goes to show that no further prophet is needed to go beyond the teaching of Jesus. No one can keep true to the New Testament and hold at the same time that another prophet, no matter how beautiful, shares with Christ the honour of His unique sonship.

The second proposition, which does not depend on the first, is worth taking on its own merits. Let us apply the tests of Jesus. And first we should recall that when Jesus refers to prophets, He does not refer to His own equals, men who occupy the same exalted position as Himself, but He treats of those humbler men who have a passing message for a passing age, men like Amos and Hosea and Isaiah and Micah. This appears in Christ's reference to John, where He says, 'But what went ye out for to see? A prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet.'

Jesus' first test is that the person shall come in His name. This is not the final test, for 'many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many,' but it is a good test that 'every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God.' It is urged that 'it will not be enough for us to say we accept Christ, if we reject those who come after Him in the name of the Lord.' But here there is ambiguity. If Dr. Esslemont means God by the term 'Lord,' it is bad New Testament scholarship. If he means Christ by 'Lord,' then patently Baha does not come in the name of Jesus Christ, since he was a follower of Mohammed.

But the essential claim to prophethood lies, one would imagine, in the modern application of the message. There is always this note of novelty in prophecy. It is for the times. But what is there in Baha'ism that is not already in Christianity? To be quite frank, I cannot find one single item in its programme that differs from the message of Christianity that is being given from thoughtful minds. Arbitration, the spirit of humanity, the equality of men and of sex, the claim of each man to realize himself, education for all, social problems—the need for piety, what new thing is there in these that we have not got in a much simpler and clearer form in Christianity? Nor have we the unhealthy and hectic optimism that talks glibly of universal peace. Not by a mild morality shall the world be saved, and when finality is cut off, as it is by Baha'ism, the note of conviction departs. Christianity has nothing to learn from Baha'ism in the ethical sphere, and has little to learn from its cheap and easy evolutionism. Abdu'l-Baha himself says, 'Know that the principles of Christianity and the commandments of Baha'u'llah are identical, and that their paths are the same.' And it certainly looks as if in his interpretation of his father's religion, the son cast his eye more than once on the Christian system.

But Baha'ism is a sweet and noble religion. If it can bring men to a saner view of life, and assist in the disentanglement of modern problems, let it have a wide welcome. It is charged with a winsome ethic. It is suffused with a gracious spirit. And yet somehow one lacks that living fire of devotion to a leader that so dominated those hearts that first heard the words, 'If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me.'

The cool and beautiful gardens that surround the old prison-house of the 'Baha' in Akka are the glory of all his followers, and like him they come and sit in the shade of the overspreading trees, sheltered from the burning heat of the sun and sand, and like him they never think that the gardens are watered by an unseen aqueduct stretching for many miles under the cool earth, an aqueduct built there nineteen hundred years ago. What if, after all, these blossoming spirits have been living on the unnoticed waters that burst fresh from the spirit of Jesus?

Contributions and Comments.

A Disarrangement in John x.

No one who has studied this chapter attentively can have failed to feel baffled by the inconsequence of the thought, especially in vv.[7-11]. Thus in v.[7] Jesus is described as the door of the sheep, and in the next verse contrasted with the thieves and robbers who went before Him. Obviously in v.[7] He should have been the shepherd, and Moffatt reads 'Shepherd' instead of 'Door,' with the Sahidic. But Moffatt's correction does not go to the root of the difficulty, and he is obliged to put v.[9], which still interrupts the sense, in brackets. I venture to suggest that in these verses we have another disarrangement of the text, and to print what I conceive was the original text in one column, and Westcott and Hort's text in the words of the R.V. in the next column:

7 Jesus therefore said again,
Verily, verily, I say unto you,
I am the door of the sheep.
9 By me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and go out and shall find pasture.
11 I am the good shepherd.
8 All that came before me are thieves and robbers: but the sheep did not hear them.
10 The thief cometh not but that he may steal, and kill, and destroy: I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly.
11 The good shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep.

7 Jesus therefore said again,
Verily, verily, I say unto you,
I am the door of the sheep.
8 All that came before me are thieves and robbers: but the sheep did not hear them.
9 I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and go out, and shall find pasture.
10 The thief cometh not, but that he may steal, and kill, and destroy: I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly.
11 I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep.

With these columns before us, it is easy to see how the disarrangement arose. Let us imagine that an early scribe was copying the first column. He wrote v.[7] correctly. Then having written, '*I am* the door of the sheep' ([7]), his eye travelled to, '*I am* the good shepherd,' led by the similarity of the beginning of the sentence; and, thinking that that is what he has just written, he continued with v.[8]. But by the time he has written v.[8], he has discovered his mistake, and goes back to the verse he has omitted ([9]). Somewhat at a loss what to do, he seeks to restore the connexion by repeating some of the last words of v.[7], 'I am the door,' and then he writes v.[9]. Now that he has repaired his error, he goes straight forward with v.[10]. But the initial mistake caused the omission of the words, 'I am the good shepherd.' When this is discovered, they are inserted at a point where they cause least apparent confusion, *i.e.* before the words, 'The good shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep.'

If this restoration of the text be accepted, the whole of the passage from the beginning of the chapter is clear. We are told in v.[6] that the 'parable' of vv.[1-5] was not understood. Jesus is enlarging on this parable in v.[7] and the following verses. And our restoration shows that He makes clear two points that were mentioned in vv.[1-5]. First He takes up the point, hinted at in the first verse, that He is the door. This is dealt with in vv.[7-9], which, in our reconstruction, form together a separate entity. Then in the remainder of the passage He deals with the main point of vv.[1-5]: He is the good shepherd.

JAMES T. HUDSON.

Hale, Manchester.

Genesis iv. 7 and a Form of Hebrew Poetry.

PROFESSOR CANNEY'S interesting suggestions in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of August last that, like *Ašmaṯh* in Am 8[14], *Ḥaṭṭā'ṯh* in Gn 4[7] does not bear its ordinary meaning but is the name of a demon or deity, leads the present writer to the suggestion that *Śe'eṯh* in the same verse (which scholars find as, if not more, difficult than *Ḥaṭṭā'ṯh*) might also stand there for the name of a demon, deity, or spirit. The translation of the verse would then be quite straightforward:

'Surely if thou doest well, *Śe'eṯh* (the good demon or spirit) croucheth at the door; but if thou doeth not well, *Ḥaṭṭā'ṯh* (the evil demon or spirit) croucheth at the door.'

Ḥaṭṭā'ṯh, coming from a root signifying 'deficiency,' 'sin,' 'erring,' is well applied to the demon of evil. *Śe'eṯh*, on the other hand, being derived from a root meaning 'rising' and 'uplifting,' is properly given to the good deity, spirit, or guardian angel.

A theory by the present writer on the Technical Forms of Hebrew Poetry, discussed elsewhere, will, if applied to Gn 4^7, throw a clearer light on the passage. According to the theory many Biblical passages which now appear in prose form were originally arranged in short lines in such a way as to avoid the necessity of the repetition of a word or phrase which belonged to both parts of a 'parallelism.' Gn 4^7 arranged in accordance with this scheme may have appeared in the original MS. as follows:

(a)^1 *We'im lō* (a) *Hălō 'im*
(c) *laṗeṯhaḥ,* (b) *ṭeṭibh*
(d)^1 *Ḥaṭṭā'ṯh* (d) *Śe'eṯh*
(e) *rōbheṣ*

(Cf. the arrangement in the printed Hebrew Bibles of the poetical portions, Ex 15^{1-18} and Dt 32^{1-43}.)

(a) is parallel to (a)^1 and (d) to (d)^1 (good *versus* evil, the guardian angel *versus* the demon of evil), while (b), (c) (e) are common to both parts.

The passage was to be read in the following order:

(a) (b), (c) (d) (e);
(a)^1 (b), (c) (d)^1 (e).

A scribe, for reasons easily explainable, instead of keeping the lines in the order of the original MS., has copied first the words on the right hand side, viz. (a) (b) (d), and then the others, viz. (a)^1 (b) (c) (d)^1 (e). [(b) has been copied twice, owing perhaps to a desire to make sense, or to the probability that in the MS. from which the scribe was copying (b) appeared midway between the right and the left.] Hence our present text.

An English equivalent of the presumed original Hebrew arrangement would be something like the following:

(a) Surely if thou (wilt) (a)^1 But if thou (wilt) not
(b) do well, (c) at the door
(d) the Guardian Angel (*Śe'eṯh*) (d)^1 the Demon of Evil
(e) croucheth. [(*Ḥaṭṭā'ṯh*)

The intended reading

(a) (b), (c) (d) (e);
(a)^1 (b), (c) (d)^1 (e)

'Surely if thou wilt do well, at the door the guardian angel croucheth; but if thou wilt not do well, at the door the demon of evil croucheth.'

The scribe copying (a) (b) (d), (a)^1 (b) (c) (d)^1 (e) obtained the reading of the present text:

'Surely if thou wilt do well, *Śe'eṯh*; but if thou wilt not do well, at the door *Ḥaṭṭ'āṯh* croucheth.'

Another possible arrangement of the verse may have been the following:

'Surely if thou wilt do well,
Śe'eṯh——
But if thou wilt not do well,
Ḥaṭṭā'ṯh croucheth at the door.'

Cf. Ps $92^{9\,(10)}$ and Ps 93^3.

ISRAEL W. SLOTKI.
Manchester.

James ii. 1.

MUCH discussion has been expended on the exegesis of the words in this passage, which, construed word by word into English, runs, 'do not with respect for persons have your faith of our Lord Jesus Christ of glory.' Some have made the last two words equivalent to 'the Shekinah,' finding in this way support for the attribution to St. James of a Christology not less lofty than that in the Fourth Gospel. Other scholars, as can be seen in Mayor's commentary, have resorted to every possible device of the grammarian to secure a satisfactory syntax and sense. None of these interpretations has been felt to be so convincing as to discourage fresh effort.

By a curious coincidence in Ac 4^{33} a precisely parallel order of words is given by the MSS whose concurrence generally attests the best reading—δυνάμει μεγάλῃ ἀπεδίδουν τὸ μαρτύριον οἱ ἀπόστολοι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως. Here Mr. T. E. Page comments as follows: 'The second genitive explains and defines the first: their testimony was "of the Lord Jesus," that is, "of His resurrection."' This suggests that we should translate our passage 'faith in our Lord Jesus'—*i.e.* in His glory. In the Acts passage the special point to which the Apostles' testimony was devoted was the fact of the Resurrection: in St. James, the special point in the Christian's belief about or in his Lord was His glory. If this is the grammatical construction, the sense should be 'if you believe

in the Lord Jesus—specially in His glory—you will not and cannot pay regard to a man's wealth or fine clothes.' It would seem that this harmonizes with other teaching in the N.T. The Crucified is also the Ascended: the Cross is the Crown: he who would be first is to be the servant of all. The Glory is Love that condescends to Service and Sacrifice set forth before men and angels as God's very nature. The Johannine parallels as to the Lord's being 'glorified' naturally suggest themselves, and perhaps we may even read this special sense of 'glory' as meaning 'the triumphant vindication of what Jesus stood for, *i.e.* that service is the path to victory' into St. Matthew's words (25^{31}), '*the throne of his glory*,' where He will sit to judge those who have and those who have not done service to Him in the persons of His little ones.

The question has been raised by a member of the Hellenistic Greek Seminar at Manchester University (before which this interpretation was laid in the first instance), whether such a non-personal objective genitive as has been here suggested is found in the N.T. after *πίστις*. Four passages have been quoted as bearing upon this point, and it is worth while to refer the reader to them. They are (1) Ac 3^{16}, *τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ*; (2) Ph 1^{27}, *τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*; (3) 2 Th 2^{13}, *πίστει ἀληθείας*,—in all which passages an objective genitive seems the unforced way of explaining the syntax; (4) Col 2^{12}, *τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ Θεοῦ*, which is certainly susceptible of the same treatment. In any case the examination of these passages seems to confirm the possibility from the grammatical side of interpreting St. James as has been suggested above.

T. NICKLIN.

Hulme Hall, Manchester.

Luke xvii. 21.

THE true interpretation of Lk 17^{21} is not to be settled so easily as Mr. Lewis assumes. In my rendering referred to, I am more than content to be in the company of Dr. Moffatt; and I must suggest that the assumption that such an interpretation is to be curtly dismissed as but one of 'certain heresies' is quite unwarranted. If the reader will consult Dr. Plummer's note in the 'International Critical Commentary' hereupon, he will find a much more fair, and true, and reliable statement. If, also, he will but turn to the plain and careful account in my book mentioned, on pp. 110 and 111—which cannot, of course, be here quoted *in extenso*—he can estimate the reasons there given for declining to accept the summary dismissals of either (1) or (2) in Mr. Lewis's contribution. As to (1): the thoughtful reading of Dr. Moffatt's rendering of this whole passage should suffice, for ordinary minds, to rule out the 'therefore' here suggested, with its inference. Whilst in regard to (2): such an assertion simply begs the whole question in dispute, which is neither criticism nor reasoning. No one, presumably, will deny that *ἡμῶν* is plural. But all the examples quoted on behalf of the 'Field' conclusion relate to the singular. As in Ps 38^{4}, *ἐντός μου*; or Mt 23^{26}, *τὸ ἐντὸς τοῦ ποτηρίου*.

The whole force of the context, one cannot but feel, shows that the decision that here *ἐντὸς ὑμῶν* can only mean *ἐντὸς ἑκάστου* is sheer dogmatism.

Mr. Lewis's final judgment concerning the duty of the Revisers expresses indeed his own opinion, but nothing more. So that there is yet liberty left for others to 'maintain patience in assertion' that Dr. Moffatt is right—as certainly also, I cannot but maintain, is my exposition in the book from which it is taken.

FRANK BALLARD.

Sheffield.

Obadiah 5.

IN the *Daily Telegraph* of December 16th, 1926, Colonel T. E. Lawrence writes as follows of a Turkish onslaught on the Awali suburb of Medina: '"This bitter taste of the Turkish mode of war sent a shock across Arabia: for the first rule of Arab war was that women were inviolable; the second, that the lives and honour of children too young to fight with men were to be spared; the third, *that property impossible to carry off should be left undamaged*' (italics mine).

Does not this third rule of Arab warfare lend some support to the idea that the first half of Ob ^{5} should be interpreted as meaning, 'If thieves came to thee, if robbers by night . . . would they not steal *only* till they had enough?' This, as has been pointed out, is required in order to make the first part of the verse parallel to the second, 'If grapegatherers came to thee, would they not leave some gleaning grapes?' and any difficulty in the conception of desert raiders leaving any valuables undamaged behind them seems now to be removed.

V. D. SIDDONS.

Wealdstone.

Recent Foreign Theology.

French Theology.

WITHIN recent years researches have been made into the ceremony of the Laying on of Hands, which appears both in O.T. and N.T. in connexion with various religious acts. It is not easy to grasp the complex ideas which underlie this primitive symbol, but the whole ground, so far as N.T. usage is concerned, has been carefully examined by Dr. J. Coppens in a thesis presented to the University of Louvain.[1] The author discusses the ceremony as an act of benediction, a sign of healing, and a rite of ordination and confirmation. The treatment is exhaustive, unless we see in 1 Ti 5^{22}, as Hammond, Ellicott, and Hort do, a reference to the imposition of hands in the reconciliation of penitents. One would have been glad to have the question more fully discussed from the point of view of the O.T., where the ceremony occupies a large place in the sacrificial system of P, but the author has only referred to the older customs where necessary to explain the later ones. He traces the Christian rite of ordination to contemporary Jewish ceremonies, based upon the traditions of the ancient law, but regards the rite of confirmation as specifically Christian and apostolic, distinct from baptism and producing special effects. In treating of the imposition of hands as a healing act, he deals with the details of the N.T. cures, which he regards as authentic, and has much to say on the cult of Æsculapius and medical methods in ancient times.

Old Testament students will be interested in a thoroughly up-to-date little book on the comparison of the Biblical and Babylonian stories of the Creation.[2] The author, Le Guen, takes first the Biblical passages, namely, Gn $1–2^{4a}$ (P) and Gn 2^{4b-25} (JE or J); next the Akkadian texts, including the poem *ênuma elish* and other pieces of literature; then the Sumerian texts (particularly two, the one from Ashur, published by Ebeling, and the other from Nippur, published by Poebel); and lastly the Greek versions of Berossus, Damascius, and Abydenus. He carefully analyses, annotates, and compares these, dealing successively with the creation of inanimate things, plants, animals, and man, and presenting the comparison in an instructive synoptic table. The Biblical version, it is pointed out, has no trace of any theogony, though Gunkel has claimed to find a primitive genealogy in Gn $1^{2, 3}$, whereas the Babylonian one is based on grotesque mythological ideas. The latter is also strongly coloured with astrological views and the worship of the heavenly bodies (especially in the *ênuma elish*), while the O.T. regards these things as enemies of monotheism. The comparison of the accounts as to the creation of the first man (in Sumerian *lilû*, in Babylonian *awîlu*) is particularly well done. The general conclusion (pp. 133 ff.), which is moderate and avoids the extreme of Pan-Babylonianism, is to the effect that the Sumero-Babylonian primitive tradition is grossly tainted with myth and polytheism, and is inferior to the Hebrew one. The author, however, does not venture into the question as to how the latter, if originally emanating from Babylonian or collateral sources, came to be modified and stripped of its mythological features.

An excellent critical study of Is 56–66, in the form of a translation and commentary, has been given by Pasteur Jacques Marty,[3] though many scholars will disagree with his views. Duhm maintained at least the unity of authorship of this third section of Isaiah, but Marty is not prepared to accept this. He regards this section as a collection of prophetic discourses, emanating from several authors, and mostly brought together without any appreciable connexion. With the exception of a short, obscure fragment (63^{1-6}) and an appendix of uncertain date (66^{18-24}), he takes them as reflecting the troubled condition of Judaism between the return from Exile (538), and the foundation of the new community in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (458–445). On this basis he assigns dates and authors to each of the component parts. The fragment $63^{7}–64^{11}$ is attributed to a writer of the Deutero-Isaiah School, about 538–520. Chapters 60, 61, 62, and 66^{5-16} have come from this source between 500 and 445, and chapters 65 and $66^{1-4, 17}$ may be traced to the same origin. Chapters 59, 58, and 56^{1-8}, which show similarities with Haggai and Zechariah, are placed between 480 and 445. Chapters $56^{9}–57^{21}$ have issued from the school of Ezekiel, about 450, and the fragment 63^{1-6} is an apocalyptic one of uncertain date (? 532–332). Marty seems aware of the difficulties resulting from such a dismemberment, and appears well acquainted

[1] *L'imposition des mains et les rites connexes dans le Nouveau Testament et dans l'église ancienne* (431 pp. De Meester, Wetteren; Gabalda, Paris).

[2] *La Création dans la Bible et les inscriptions akkadiennes et sumériennes* (140 pp. L'Université, Angers).

[3] *Les chapitres* 55–66 *du livre d'Esaie, traduits et commentés* (196 pp. Geuthner, Paris).

with critical works on the subject. He is more conservative, however, than Cheyne, who saw in the Trito-Isaiah a collection of ten compositions, all of them from the age of Nehemiah, except 63^{7}–64^{11}, which he assigned to the reign of Artaxerxes Ochus, or about 360.

The national changes through which Yahwism passed, from the time of Moses to that of Christ, are discussed in *Israel et la vision de l'humanité*.[1] The author, Prof. A. Causse, deals principally with the development of Yahwism from a small clan religion, confined within the desert of Kadesh, to the world-wide one of the later Jewish prophets. The latter, he thinks, was favoured by the rise of the Persian empire, which helped to bring about a religious syncretism, owing to unity of language, religious tolerance, and the search for the supreme God. This syncretism was rather opposed, however, by the monotheism of the Deutero-Isaiah, and under Ezra and Nehemiah nationalism again triumphed, the *Torah* forming an insuperable barrier which made Israel a separate people. Joel denounced the *Goiim*, and the author of Chronicles confined his history to the House of David and the sanctuary of Zion. Still, a small number of Psalmists and prophets continued to predict the universal reign of Yahweh, and the Book of Jonah was a protest against dislike of other nations, such as the Book of Esther reveals. Is 19^{18-25} predicted the conversion of Egypt and Assyria. The Book of Judith and the earlier apocalyptic writings sustained these immense hopes. The author of the Book of Wisdom proclaimed that every soul, immortal and beloved of God, could find a philosophy and religion in Israel. Philo endeavoured to reconcile Moses and Plato, and Jesus at length announced to the world a Kingdom of God for all men of goodwill. The value of the author's theory depends, of course, on his chronological views, and he does not always justify these, but the book in spite of its errors shows considerable scholarship.

Much has been written on the question as to whether the conception of a series of heavens is found in the Scriptures. The idea of a plurality of heavens, amounting in most cases to seven, prevailed among the Babylonians, Persians, and others, and occupied a large place in Rabbinical literature, and in the apocalyptic and other pseudo-epigraphical books. Even Clement of Alexandria and Origen seem to have upheld the idea, and it was not until Chrysostom declared it to be a human fancy that it was repudiated by the Church and adopted by Mohammedanism. The whole question was largely mixed up with that of Paradise, its location, its extent, its glories. Those who wish an 'exposé historique' of the Christian conception of the first centuries on these matters will find it in *Le Paradis terrestre au troisième ciel*, by De Vuippens.[2] The author deals with the cosmogony of the Hebrews and Greeks. For the former people, the universe included a subterranean region (sheol), a lower stage on earth, and a higher stage in the heavens (the abode of God). In the time of Paul the expression τρίτος οὐρανός designated the third planetary heaven according to a descending scale (first, the zone of Saturn; second, that of Jupiter; third, that of Mars, etc.). It was not until the eighth century that Christians began to place Paradise in the empyreal sphere. Scholars will not agree with some of the author's interpretations of the Hebrew text, but the volume, which is a thesis for the diploma of Doctor, is clearly written and based on good documentary evidences.

J. W. Jack.

Glenfarg.

[1] 152 pp. Istra, Strasbourg.

Protestantism in Post-War Germany.

Dr. Julius Richter, in an informing contribution to the *Christian Century* (Chicago), says: 'In all the strenuous days since the War the German churches did not lose their courage.' He describes their re-organization as entirely independent Free Churches on a 'presbyterial-synodal' foundation, and continues: 'they had the faith to envisage, beyond this, a more complete amalgamation of their forces in the shape of the German Evangelical Church Federation. It has, in important questions, executive powers, binding upon the allied churches. It is now possible to speak of the "German Evangelical Church" as an organic unity.'

It is a welcome sign of the times and a striking confirmation of Dr. Richter's estimate of the present situation that Protestant scholars and ecclesiastical leaders, of different schools of thought and belonging to different communions, have united in the publication of a handsome volume[3] containing thirty

[2] 144 pp. L'Université, Fribourg.

[3] *Der Protestantismus der Gegenwart*, unter Mitwirkung führender Persönlichkeiten des kirchlichen und theologisch-wissenschaftlichen Lebens. Herausgegeben von Stadtpfarrer Dr.theol. G. Schenkel. (Stuttgart: Verlag Friedrich Bohnenberger. Seiten xiv, 810. Rm.38.50.)

essays on 'Contemporary Protestantism,' by almost as many authors, selected because of their expert knowledge and representing not only Lutherans, Calvinists, and Zwinglians, but also the Free Churches. In a comprehensive world-view the position of Protestantism to-day, not only on the Continent, but also in Great Britain, America, etc., is described in detail. But of chief interest to English-speaking Christians is the account given of the prospects of Protestantism in Germany and its relations with Roman Catholicism.

Professor Hermelink of Marburg is specially qualified to write on 'Protestantism and Catholicism.' To *Die Christliche Welt* he regularly contributes a well-informed and non-controversial chronicle of Roman Catholic doings and sayings—*Vom Katholizismus der Gegenwart.* The conclusion to which he has come after long-continued and not unsympathetic study is that he can see no hope of bridging the confessional chasm which has existed for four hundred years. But he gladly recognizes that since Evangelical and Catholic soldiers fought, side by side, in the War, and clergy of both communions lived together, in daily intimacy, as chaplains to the troops, a better atmosphere has been created and mutual misunderstandings have been removed. He notes with satisfaction, that not one of the more than a hundred speakers at the Stockholm World-Conference uttered an unfriendly word about the Roman Catholic Church.

Hermelink's comment on the relations which have subsisted between the two Confessions since the Reformation is that, although the Pope is no longer identified with the Antichrist of the Apocalypse, Protestants are of one mind in emphatically rejecting all 'papalistic intolerance and spiritual domination.' On the other hand, he acknowledges that in other Churches there have been 'little popes,' and to them his condemnation equally applies. It is pointed out that Zwingli and Calvin, with greater emphasis than Luther, explained the breach with the Papacy as the necessary consequence of Rome's apostasy from the Christianity of apostolic days. All Protestants, whether known as 'Reformed' or not, agree in regarding the Reformation as a return to the New Testament simplicity of the gospel.

Interesting examples are given of mutual brotherly recognition of each other by influential representatives of the two Confessions.[1] Approval of such Christian tolerance is found in the teaching of Luther, who held that members of the *ecclesia spiritualis* were to be found in both communions. Ultramontanism, however, is denounced as being 'not only a religious, but also a national danger.' After the War, Hermelink says that 'for a while it did appear as though Catholicism was the only power that had won the war.' But in his opinion there was unnecessary alarm among Protestants. 'It is noteworthy that the isolated voices of Catholics, expressing openly their consciousness of victory, have been quickly hushed.'

Hermelink writes as a staunch, but not bigoted Protestant; his loyalty to the essential principles of the Reformation adds impressiveness to his insistence on the discharge by German Protestants of their present duty to their 'Roman Catholic fellow-citizens and fellow-Christians': that duty is not to engage in another *Kulturkampf,* but to manifest 'Christian love and patience' in spite of unjust attacks upon and slanderings of the Reformation. 'It is on the arena of Christian piety that the battle will be fought which will decide the issue between the two Confessions.'

In the latter half of his essay, Hermelink directs attention to the differences between the Catholic and the Protestant types of piety. A leading characteristic of Roman Catholicism is its 'consciousness of unity'—unity in faith, in order, and in worship. To those who prophesy that 'the divisions of Protestantism will be its ruin,' the reply is that 'the uniting force of collective Protestantism is the Word of God'—the living word, that calls forth repentance and faith, the word also of forgiveness. All the reform movements of our time, and especially all aspirations towards unity, must be judged by this standard: they must give 'greater prominence to that which, by common consent, is the chief concern of collective Protestantism, *verbum Dei manet in aeternum.*' On familiar lines the Protestant doctrine of *sola fide* is contrasted with the Catholic conception of degrees of piety, the higher grades of which can be attained only by those who heroically renounce the world and whose reward is to be canonized as saints. The Protestant ideal of sainthood may be realized in the lowliest earthly callings, for in the discharge of life's normal duties the heroism of faith may be manifested in daily bearing of the Cross.

On other aspects of his far-reaching theme, Hermelink writes with similar candour and courtesy. Only a few of his appreciations and criticisms have been given, and these only in brief outline. But mention must be made of his plea that the word 'Evangelical' should not banish the word 'Protestant,' seeing that all the Churches included in the newly formed Federation 'protest against the claims to world-domination of the Papal Church which has no just right to call itself Catholic, that is, Universal.'

J. G. TASKER.

Leamington Spa.

[1] It is mentioned that for fifteen years (1830–1845) a religious journal was published in Baden whose joint editors were a Roman Catholic priest and a Lutheran pastor. 'Never will Protestantism cease to believe in a genuinely evangelical kernel within Catholicism.'

Entre Nous.

Ernest De Witt Burton and Chinese Missions.

THE death last year of Ernest De Witt Burton, the President of the University of Chicago, has meant an almost irreparable loss to New Testament scholarship in America. The Chicago University Press is to be congratulated on having issued so soon a life of Dr. Burton (noticed this month under 'Literature'). It has at the same time issued a collection of his papers and addresses with the title *Christianity in the Modern World* (10s. net). A number of the addresses are reprinted from 'The Biblical World,' of which Dr. Burton was editor for a number of years. They have been chosen as giving the essence of his thinking on the religion of Jesus and its application in Christian education and world problems. But for ill-health he would himself have gone to the mission field, and in his last public address—in April 1925—he dealt with 'The Future of Christian Education in China.' He made the following three practical suggestions which should not be lightly set aside to-day :

'Let us remember that control by the Chinese —complete control—is the goal of our efforts ; that we are not in China to maintain a Christian movement which is essentially foreign. We are there to make ourselves dispensable as soon as possible. The characteristic of the foreign missionary movement is that it becomes successful by putting itself out of business.'

'Shall Christian schools make attendance at Bible classes and religious services compulsory ? This does not seem to me an essential part of our Christian education in China. The *quality* of our education in Christianity is far more important than that it be compulsory. If it is not compulsory, it must compete, on the same level, with other subjects. If its quality is high we should not fear such competition. I hesitate to say it, yet—if I am to believe the testimony of those who have been in immediate contact with the situation—it has sometimes been true in our mission schools that Christianity has been less effectively taught than any other subject in the curriculum. Is that a tolerable situation ? Suppose we reverse the situation ? Cease to make attendance at classes in Christianity compulsory, but make those classes second to none in the quality of the work offered and the ability of the teaching given, and what will be the result ? Will students be more likely to be won to Christianity by being required to attend instruction of poor quality, or by being given the privilege of attending classes which are of the highest caliber of any work offered in the school ? Do away with compulsion and substitute high quality, and I do not fear the results.'

'Finally, I believe that we ought to be ready to make any adjustment whatever in order to achieve the fundamental purpose for which we are maintaining Christian education in China. I hope the time will never come when we shall have to face the question of conducting schools in which no religion can be taught. But if we should have to face that question, what would be our answer ? My answer would be that I would *stay in China* ; that I would stay and seek to express the Christian spirit by giving the most helpful service I could render to the Chinese, even if they refused to let me give them in words what they can not and will not refuse me the opportunity of expressing in life.'

Why I am Content to be a Christian.

The first address in *Christianity in the Modern World* was originally delivered before various non-Christian audiences in India, China, and Japan. It is Dr. Burton's *apologia pro vita sua*. There are six reasons, he says, why he is joyous to be a Christian.

1. 'I am content to be a Christian because Christianity is a religion of intellectual liberty—a religion which, making truth supreme, leaves me free, requires me, indeed, to accept whatever is true.' This character was stamped on it by its founder, Jesus of Nazareth. He did not ask, as His contemporaries, What did our fathers hold ? He asked simply, What is true ? and so although retaining, also rejecting, much that His contemporaries accepted.

2. 'I am content to be a Christian because Christianity, being a religion of intellectual liberty, is able to appropriate to itself truth from whatever source it comes, and, what is even more difficult, leave behind its own outlived elements.' He gives as an example here the attitude of Jesus towards the Fast Days and towards the eating of clean and unclean food. Asked why His disciples were not punctilious to keep the Law about clean and unclean food, He answered, 'Not that which enters into a man defiles a man, but that which goeth forth from him defiles him.' Modern Christianity still has this power and has shown it in its attitude to science, to

which it has surrendered much but from which it has also learned much, so that to-day we no longer fear it. 'For however scientific men may confuse truth and error, in the end true science can only bring us truth and thereby make us richer.'

3. 'But I am content to be a Christian still more because Christianity is a religion of spiritual power. It maintains that fellowship of the human soul with God is possible, and vindicates that claim by a long line of men in whom faith in such fellowship has brought purity and power.'

4. 'I am content to be a Christian because Christianity sets before men a high ethical standard, and highest precisely in this: that it demands that men shall care not supremely for their own welfare, even their own moral welfare, but shall seek their own good in the good of their fellows. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and thy neighbor is thy fellow-man, and to love him is to seek his welfare in all its phases and aspects.'

5. 'Again, I am content to be a Christian because Christianity is a religion of broad horizon.' Dr. Burton finds that the community of Christianity is larger than the tribe and the nation; larger even than the race. 'Christianity, believing in fellowship with God, makes him the first member of its community, and then recognizing that he is the God of all men, and all men are one race, takes into its community all those to whom belongs the name of man.' But not even there is the limit drawn, for the birds of the air and the beasts of the earth are also objects of the Heavenly Father's care and so also of our consideration.

6. 'Finally, I am content to be a Christian because Christianity embodies its ideals in a person who not only taught the truth, but perfectly exemplified it in his life and is to-day the mightiest force for the uplifting of men and nations.' The Christian sees in the life of Jesus the perfect ideal of human life which is at the same time the challenge and inspiration to him. But more than that, he sees in Jesus the supreme revelation of God.

Do It Again.

The Student Christian Movement has published a volume of essays by Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick with the stirring title *Adventurous Religion* (6s. net). The essays are very diverse. Here are some of the titles—'On Being a Real Skeptic,' 'Concerning Prayer,' 'Science and Religion,' 'The Desire for Immortality,' 'What Christian Liberals are driving at.' But though they are diverse in subject they are held together by the fact that they all have the same background—the situation which has arisen in the American Churches on account of Fundamentalism. They are held together also by the desire of the writer 'to separate religion altogether from the fickle ups and downs of theological and sectarian strife and to make it appear, as it is, an integral part of a wholesome life.' To show Dr. Fosdick's point of view we cannot do better than quote what he has to say on the core of religion:

'In Nottingham, England, is the Wesleyan chapel where William Booth, founder of the Salvation Army, was converted. A memorial tablet keeps fresh in recollection the fact that there this notable friend of the friendless received his baptism of spiritual power. Naturally, the chapel has become a shrine of pilgrimage for Salvation Army leaders from around the world. One day an aged colored man in the uniform of the Army was found by the minister of the chapel standing with uplifted eyes before the tablet.

'"Can a man say his prayers here?" he asked.

'"Of course," was the minister's answer, "a man can say his prayers here."

'And the old Salvation Army officer went down on his knees and, lifting his hands before the tablet, prayed, "O God, do it again! Do it again!"

'That prayer is the touchstone of abiding reality in religion. The reproducible experiences concerning which men can pray across the centuries, in all sorts of mental settings, "Do it again!" are the vital elements.'[1]

[1] H. E. Fosdick, *Adventurous Religion*, p. 292.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

UNDER the attractive title *The Bible of Jesus* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 7s. 6d. net), the Rev. W. M. GRANT, M.A., D.D., has written a book, the contents of which are thus modestly summarized in the publishers' notice: 'How Jesus used the Old Testament—and why.' The book really covers more ground than the title would lead us to expect. There is, for example, a chapter entitled 'The Education of Jesus,' dealing with His home, school, pilgrimages, work, etc., and another on 'The World to which Jesus Came,' which discusses the various parties in Judaism—Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, Zealots, Herodians. Such chapters furnish us with the historical context, and they have their own relevance.

The interest of the book is twofold. Dr. GRANT shows us that Jesus, like ourselves, had a 'Bible within the Bible,' and, further, he uses Jesus' attitude to the Old Testament as an avenue along which we may advance to a more adequate understanding of the consciousness of Jesus. His mind is reflected alike in His appreciative selection of some passages and in His criticism of others.

On the first point he reminds us, following a careful computation of Dr. Moulton's, that twenty-five per cent. of our Lord's quotations or allusions come from the Pentateuch, about fifty per cent. from the Prophets and Daniel, and twenty per cent. from the Psalms, while the other books yield some five per cent. This statement reveals not only the range of His knowledge but the nature of His preferences. It is no surprise that, in One whom popular opinion regarded as a prophet, interest in the prophetic and cognate sections of Old Testament literature should considerably preponderate.

On the second point, which after all is but another aspect of the first, he writes with much discrimination in the chapter on 'The Temple and Sacrifice,' perhaps the most valuable chapter in the book. There he points out that our Lord's adoption of the description of the Temple in Is 56^7 as 'a house of *prayer* for *all* peoples' is a vivid revelation of His own real mind about the Temple. He does not think of it as a place of sacrifice, but as a place of prayer ; nor does He think of it as a place for the Jews only, but for all peoples. In other words, His real interest in the building, which was popularly identified with ritual and sacrifice, lay in its furnishing an opportunity for the exercise of the spiritual and universal religion of the prophets. So by this road again we are led back to the conclusion that our Lord's supreme interest in the Old Testament was the prophetic interest. Indeed, Dr. GRANT roundly says, 'For the sacrificial system Jesus had no use'—in which case He would but be animated, according to many scholars, by the spirit of His great predecessors, the pre-exilic prophets.

Twice in the course of the book a gentle remonstrance is administered to the Fundamentalists. They are reminded that mechanical theories of the

inspiration of the letter find no support in the teaching of Jesus, and further that those are not the best friends of the Bible who say of it 'all or nothing.' Our Lord's own attitude to the Old Testament was one of 'authority, superiority, and reserve.' While some of its utterances and tempers He endorsed, others He criticized and either modified or superseded. 'A base nationalism, retaliation, revenge, and blow for blow He reprobated either in overt act or in motive, even though ancient Scriptures had sanctioned them.'

More particularly did He transform the Apocalyptic and Messianism of His time by spiritualizing and moralizing them in the light of the prophetic ideals which inspired alike His activity and His thought. But more or less is this true of His attitude to the entire Old Testament. This Dr. GRANT happily illustrates by an adaptation of a familiar quotation, remarking, in the words of the hymn, that what Jesus did for the Old Testament was:

To pour fresh life on every part,
And new create the whole.

In discussing our Lord's use of Ps 110, Dr. GRANT utters the timely warning—a warning which we would fain hope will soon be unnecessary—that He is not here 'throwing His shield over the Davidic authorship of the Psalm.' This question, which is a purely literary one, was not before Him, nor indeed before any one of that time. On this and similar questions, such as the authorship of the Pentateuch, He accepted the traditional view. His mission was to lead men into a more abundant life, not to teach them literary criticism. Or, as Dr. GRANT wisely puts it, questions of origin and date, 'important as they are in their own sphere, do not give us the face of God, for they were non-essentials then, and they are non-essentials now.'

An interesting question raised by Dr. GRANT at different points of the argument touches the originality of Jesus. There are worthy people who are grieved to learn that some of the sayings of Jesus are not new, and that He repeated many of the great ideas and even much of the language of former days. There are, however, more answers than one which ought to satisfy the timid souls who are jealous for the Lord and His originality.

The first answer is that in an historical religion such leaning upon the past is not only reasonable but inevitable. The ages are linked each to each. Each teacher stands in a great succession, and Jesus, who is incomparably the greatest of them all, yet stands in that succession, albeit as its crown and consummation.

The second answer is that, even when Jesus endorses an older utterance, He sets His own peculiar stamp upon it. He accepts the Decalogue, but in accepting it He transforms it. How vastly more comprehensive and awful are its demands when interpreted by the penetrating spirit of Jesus. The sixth and seventh commandments stand; but how they search and try the secret places, when the mind of Jesus is behind them!

The third answer is that the kind of originality which some people desiderate simply does not exist. As a great Scottish philosopher used to say, 'A thought which was original in the sense of never having entered, in any shape or form, into any one of all the thoughtful minds among the generations of men would probably stamp a man as qualifying for an asylum.' Originality should not be strained to mean the saying of something which has never been said before. To the scholar who pointed out that every petition in the Lord's Prayer could be found among the sayings of the Rabbis, Wellhausen is said to have replied, 'Yes, and how much more!' Originality, on one of its sides, is the power to see the thing that matters: and on the field of human life, did any one ever see as Jesus saw?

Dr. GRANT does well to emphasize the point that our Lord's use of the Old Testament has a persuasiveness about it which by no means always characterizes the allusions to it of the evangelists or of Paul. Such an application of Hos 11^1 as is made by Matthew, or such an allegorical interpretation of Abraham's two sons as is offered by Paul in Gal 4, would be as good as inconceivable

upon the lips of Jesus. It would be folly to make the modern mind the final measure of all reasonable interpretation; nevertheless, the inevitableness and cogency with which His use of the Old Testament appeals to us to-day in all its pristine freshness enhances our sense of adoring wonder and confirms in us the assurance—though it needs no confirmation—that He is Lord indeed.

In a preceding volume, 'Personality and Reality,' Dr. J. E. TURNER set out his proofs of a Supreme Self, personal, self-conscious, dominant in the universe, not merely of material and physical existents, even when we include the starry worlds far beyond our ken, but in the universe of elements, forces, and factors, and, in a word, all the realities 'other than and exclusive of the Supreme Self.' Now, in *The Nature of Deity* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. net), this accomplished Reader in Philosophy in the University of Liverpool carries on the argument to a further and a higher stage. If it is important to have a proof of the being of a Supreme Self in the universe, it is vital to know what kind of Deity He is. The question as to the Nature of Deity Dr. Turner answers, chiefly after the method of Butler, by proofs from analogy. The analogies are drawn from human personality—always with a caveat as to its imperfection—with its self-consciousness, will, and freedom. As the human personality lives within its environment, acting upon it and through it, developing its resources, realizing its possibilities, creating and adapting its methods and machineries, and again is reacted upon, so the Supreme Self is dynamic, free, purposeful, a Real, who can be known and loved and served.

This leaves the primary question of creation on one side, although it is discussed after the main positions have been stated. Yet the admission is made that it does not lie within the power of human reason to solve it. But a clear light is thrown on the evolution of the universe. On page after page there is explained the ever-continuing advance of the universe in complexity, diversity, delicacy, and in fitness for further and higher function, under the purpose and will of the Supreme Self. Every stage in progress results in a recognizable Emergent. A new type, a more sensitized creature, a more subtly functioned being, appears. The whole universe is passing onwards and upwards, leaving vestiges of the past, but producing ever more definitely constituted and more responsive personalities. In this lies the proof of the Supreme Reality. In these personalities and their nature we find the illuminating analogies of the Personality of Deity.

The illustrations by which the broad argument from analogy is pressed are apt and enlightening. The whole world of mechanism, with its passion for the perfecting of the instruments of manufacture and industry, of travel and intercourse, of expression and influence, reveals minds planning and adapting. The personality is concealed all the more certainly as these adapted instruments become almost independent of human guidance. In a similar way, and more closely analogical, the artist who expresses his conception in a picture, the poet who pours his passion into a sonnet, the man of superb genius—a Shakespeare or a Dante—all analogize the method and the power of the Supreme Self in the universe. Even a child's wondering and simple acts lead us into the same secret.

From this exposition of his central position as to the Nature of Deity, Dr. TURNER passes on to deal with the distinctive features of the character he finds disclosed. He meets the problem, which baffles some minds at the threshold, in the term 'infinite,' by pointing out that the only meaning it can have is 'perfect,' or 'complete.' Wherein any declaration of infinitude lies beyond perfection it is incomprehensible. As a Hegelian, Dr. TURNER identifies it with the Absolute. As a consequence the knowledge of the Deity is comprehensive, certain, and instantaneous in its intention. In a like manner he resolves the problem of the apparent conflict of the transcendence and immanence of the Deity by the conclusion that the Deity is immanent throughout the material universe so far as its infinitely complex *nature* is concerned, but absolutely transcendent of that universe so far as His perfectly automatic *function* is concerned.

From this point onward the discussion focuses on the more distinctively ethical features of the Deity. Omniscience and omnipotence are evident, but they are not arbitrary in the sense of being free from Law, or subversive of the system of things. The Supreme Self cannot 'do what He likes,' even as a great general or statesman cannot do what he likes, except at a serious risk to his country. Action is dependent on rationality. That leads on to the problem of existence of pain and of evil under such a Deity. But pain is the natural accompaniment of sentience with a purpose of good, while evil is the inevitable correlate of freedom. Man is not an animal with instincts, and evil has its function in a world of men free to choose.

Having outlined the Nature of Deity as against what may be called the background of the *existentia* of the universe, the writer leads us into a more spiritual realm as the climax of his argument. The Divine purpose in creation, the supreme motive of love, and its most august expression in holiness are affirmed. Here he opposes Otto's declaration that the Holy is the 'wholly other' to man, because he is the 'mysterious.' The Deity is 'mysterious,' it is maintained, only in attributes of which we can form no conception, because they do not fall within our experience. But this does not apply to His holiness, for He is not exclusively holy. Were Otto's contention accurate it would raise an impassable barrier between Deity and man. The Divine is not *wholly* other. In the closing chapters, the inner experience of the relationship of man and the Deity are discussed in a tone of fine feeling, closing with an affirmation of the Fatherliness, rather than the Fatherhood, of God. A notable book, full of suggestion, persuasively reasoned, with appealing references to the recognized psychologists of the day! But there is no reference to the mind of Christ—the Master of parabolic analogy!

In a remarkable book, *The Future of Christianity*, reviewed in another column, perhaps the most remarkable essay is that on 'The Doctrine of Christ,' by the Rev. W. R. Matthews, D.D., Dean of King's College, London. Dr. Matthews is one of the most original and suggestive thinkers in the Church at the present time, and everything he writes bears the stamp of a masculine and fertile mind. This is the reason why one comes to his reflections on the essential Christian faith with keen expectation. We are all alive to the fact that on the answer to the question, 'What think ye of Christ?' depends our judgment of the future of the world and of its spiritual destiny, because this depends on the essential truth of the Christian Fact.

The Christian Fact is that 'Christ is the completely adequate revelation of the nature of God, Himself one with God, the response of the Eternal to the world's need, worthy of the uttermost service and adoration, the rightful Lord of the Universe.' That is how Dr. Matthews describes the Christian faith, and the object of his essay is to show that what Christian faith has found in Christ can be found still, without disloyalty to the new revelation of scientific, historical, and philosophical truth which we possess. In this connexion Dr. Matthews asserts two things of vast importance to all believers. One is that no development of knowledge can take us beyond Christ. And the other is that 'the advance of thought is making the apprehension of God in Christ easier and not harder.'

The two problems which the essay considers are these. First, that which concerns history and centres on (Dr. Matthews has the unpardonable phrase 'centres round') the consciousness of Jesus and the impression He made on His disciples. And, second, the more fundamental problem which arises from our changed conception of the structure of the universe. The first of these problems has often been canvassed, but Dr. Matthews says his own say about it. He protests very justly against the common fallacy, of which so many recent writers are guilty, of reading back into the mind of Jesus our own fancies. Mr. Murry is a great sinner in that respect. But Dr. Matthews equally sets aside the habit of speaking of the 'claims' of Jesus. He made no claim to Messiahship in a public manner until His trial. Our Lord's method was to lead men, through the knowledge of Himself, to ask whether *this* was not the Hope of Israel.

The essay summarizes what we can gather of our Lord's view of Himself briefly. Jesus associated His own Person and mission with the culminating intervention of God in human affairs. He regarded Himself as the Central Figure in this central event. He was crucified because He admitted that He was the Christ, the Son of the Blessed. He assumed in all His teaching that He was 'the spiritual ruler of mankind.' He enjoyed an unbroken 'filial consciousness . . . unruffled by any evidence of the sense of sin.' The attempt, therefore, to envisage Jesus as a mere teacher of righteousness makes nonsense of the records. 'In His own consciousness He was the culmination of the religious history of the Hebrews, the centre of God's final self-manifestation.'

If we approach these facts believing in the living God, we shall find no inherent improbability in the estimation of His own significance which the gospel records plainly ascribe to Jesus. But, further, we have to take into account the creative experience which we find in the New Testament, the beginning of a continuous Christian experience which is the standing evidence for the significance of Christ. Whatever the differences may be between John and Paul and Hebrews in the categories, they all found the same thing in Christ, and are all trying in their different ways to say the same thing. And it is the thing that believers have found in Christ all down the ages.

When Dr. MATTHEWS turns to the other point, which is virtually whether we can justify this faith in the face of modern knowledge, he begins with the Ritschlian assertion that faith is a judgment of value and has nothing to do with metaphysics. He admits that all real faith must begin with a judgment value, because our faith is founded on experience. But the absolute separation between judgments of value and judgments of existence cannot be maintained, simply because we cannot leave aside the question whether Christ, in addition to being a Saviour, is also the revealer of the nature of the ultimate reality of the universe.

This question we must face, and when we do so we meet the fact of evolution, which is the dominating certainty of our age. And we have to state our doctrine of Christ so that it may be in harmony with an evolutionary view of the world-process. The objection that development and finality are contradictory does not detain Dr. MATTHEWS. He points out that when we are considering beauty or truth we assume finality to be possible. The real crux is not that, but the nature of God's relation to the world. Briefly Dr. MATTHEWS' view is that it is of the nature of God to create, and that creation is the self-expression and self-fulfilling of God. This gives us a clue to the meaning of the world-process. It is the history of the growing victory of the Divine life, the triumph of this life over 'negativity' and the achievement of unity in more and more complexity.

In human personality we begin to catch sight of something in the nature of a culmination or end. God seeks the expression of His own Being, and, as an essential part of that expression, the development of free spirits who may be in unbroken fellowship with Himself. The Eternal Personality is not fully manifested until, within time and space, there has appeared a Person who is its own image. In the Person of Jesus the creative life which we may discern working through all the course of evolution, overcomes all the limitations which have prevented it from finding complete expression. The empirical, historical personality of Jesus is the adequate incarnation in time and space of the Eternal Word.

A Lost Verse of St. John's Gospel.

By J. Rendel Harris, Litt.D., LL.D., D.D., Birmingham.

We are accustomed to the experience of finding that the received texts of ancient authors have been subject to accretion in the course of time, and it is one of the commonest results of critical study that a well-known passage is relieved of its cumbrous additions and presented in an attenuated form. This is especially noticeable in the text of the New Testament when it has passed through the hands of expert editors; sometimes whole verses disappear, such as the story of the angel troubling the pool, or the last twelve verses of Mark, or the series of glosses in the last chapters of Luke. It is not necessary to explore in this article the causes which have led to textual excess, nor, even if we concede the existence of such causes, are we disposed always to follow the conclusions of the editors who make allowance for them. Nothing, in our judgment, can be more fallacious than the too rigid application of a series of supposed canons of criticism, such as the preference for the harder reading, the shorter reading, and the like. In the present article we are going to affirm that not only is it sometimes true that the longer reading is correct, but we are going also to suggest that, in a particular case, a whole verse ought to be added to the text which does not appear in any existing known MS. or quoted version.

All modern students of the New Testament are familiar with the central position which is now occupied by the *Diatessaron of Tatian*, and especially by the commentary upon the same which was made in the fourth century by Ephrem, the great Syrian father. This commentary is at present only known by its Armenian translation, of which the Latin equivalent was published by the fathers of the Convent of St. Lazaro at Venice, and which is generally quoted under the name of its last editor, Dr. George Mösinger, of Salzburg. In this text, the distinction between the passages of the *Diatessaron* and Ephrem's commentary upon it is made by the use of special type for the Biblical matter and ordinary type for the interpretation. The careful student soon finds out that he cannot always be sure of the points where Ephrem moves from text to commentary or conversely. For example, in the seventeenth chapter of Matthew, where Jesus discusses with Peter the problem of the payment of tribute, we have a sequence like the following in which we give the spacing of the text as in the edition of Mösinger:

> Et addidit: *Vade ad mare et mitte ibi rete.* Quia me putarunt alienum, doceat se mare, me non solum sacerdotem esse, sed et regem. Vade ergo et tu quoqueda, quasi unus ex alienis.

It was my good fortune to show that the whole of the last sentence ought to have been italicised; for I found it in a single Greek MS., known as Codex Algerinæ Peckover, as well as in the Arabic Harmony of Tatian, from which it was certain that the sentence, whatever it means, was a part of Tatian's text. It is a question to be reserved whether it is a part of the original text of Matthew or not. We only refer to it here in illustration of our statement that the transitions from one kind of type to the other in Mösinger are sometimes insecure.

Now let us turn to another passage in Ephrem's commentary, where again we will follow the editor and his MSS. in the selection of type. In the fourth chapter of John we find the following sequence:

> *Si scires eum qui dixit tibi, Da mihi de aqua ista ad bibendum, tu petiisses ab eo. Dicit ad eum mulier: Tibi non est situla et puteus profundus est.* Dicit ei: Mea aqua e coelo descendit. Doctrina nempe est rerum sublimium, potus coelestis, ex quo qui bibunt, amplius non sitiunt.

Now if we examine carefully the unitalicised matter before us, we can hardly fail to conclude that it is composed both of text and commentary. The water that comes from heaven is explained to be the heavenly draught which Jesus gives. It is evident that the words, 'He saith to her, My water comes down from heaven,' are a part of the dialogue between Jesus and the woman, and follow naturally on the allusion to the water that comes up from beneath. They are an answer to the question, Whence hast Thou that living water? This sentence, then, belongs to Tatian's text of John. It is reasonable to believe also that the words were in his copy of the Gospel, and that they are not the work of an ordinary transcriber or interpreter. We infer, then, that the sentence

should be restored to the text of the Gospel, as well as to the spaced matter in Ephrem's commentary. They form an excellent parallel to those other sentences in which Jesus speaks of Himself as the living bread which came down from heaven. The existing text of John is in defect, by loss of an important sentence. It does not, however, appear that any other of the great Harmonies, such as the Liège Harmony of Dr. Plooij, has anything to suggest the omission of the passage. Its restoration is due to the Syriac Diatessaron, and, as far as the present inquiry goes, to that only.

It is no slight satisfaction to have restored even a single sentence to the discourse of our Lord in the Fourth Gospel. Nor need we refrain from putting the passage into the Film of a Commentary. The well into which the woman is peering downwards is *Tradition*; she says so; our father Jacob drank of this well and gave it to us: the well was what St. Peter calls πατροπαράδοτος. The heaven toward which the Redeemer is pointing is *Illumination*; He says so. Here ends the commentary; I hope it has not obscured the text.

At this point I was touched on the sleeve by another writer who says that he also has commented on the lost verse, in the words:

> An endless fountain of immortal drink
> Pouring unto us from the heaven's brink.

His comment is truly Johannine, and he says his name is John Keats.

The Messiahship of Jesus.

I.

The Evidence of St. Mark.

By the Reverend J. O. F. Murray, D.D., Selwyn College, Cambridge.

In a paper[1] on 'The Witness of the Baptist,' I examined the first of the objections which Wendt brings against the historical value of the Fourth Gospel. Wendt's second objection turns on the difference between St. Mark and St. John with regard to the publication of the Messiahship of Jesus. This objection is urged afresh by Lord Charnwood in his vigorous and welcome contribution to the discussion of the Johannine problem in *According to Saint John*. An account, in which all public reference to Messiahship is strictly repressed until the final visit to Jerusalem, stands, no doubt, in startling contrast to an account, in which the first disciple to follow Jesus goes at once to call his brother saying, 'We have found the Messiah.' It is difficult to resist the assumption that the contrast amounts in fact to an irreconcilable contradiction.

The issue, however, is by no means as simple as this. We cannot, as Foakes-Jackson and Lake rightly insist, treat the term 'Messiah' as if it possessed a fixed and universally recognized content. It clearly meant one thing to the Jew and another to the Samaritan. The hopes that it aroused in the heart of the aged Symeon in Jerusalem had very little in common with the hopes of Judas of Galilee. There is therefore no *a priori* objection to the hypothesis that the conditions were such as to make an indiscriminate use of the title in Galilee extremely dangerous. At the same time the Office or Offices connoted by it stood in an organic relation to 'the Kingdom of God.' And, if the title meant so much to Jesus that, as Lord Charnwood admits, He was ready to die rather than forgo His claim to it, it is incredible that He sprang His claim to the title on the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem, in the last week of His ministry, entirely without preparation. 'The clear-cut sequence of facts, as St. Mark conceives them, concerning His declaration of Himself whether as "Messiah" or as "Son of God,"' which appeals so strongly to Lord Charnwood (p. 122) cannot be a complete account of this matter. There is room for an inquiry whether here again, as in regard to the witness of the Baptist, the accounts of St. Mark and St. John, so far from being in direct contradiction, are in fact complementary.

The issue is at once too deep and too wide to be limited to the discussion of the meaning and use of a

[1] The Expository Times, December 1925.

single word. It raises the whole question of the relation of the Person of Jesus to His work, and of the method and process of His self-revelation. I propose, therefore, to go over the familiar ground once more to see exactly 'who' and 'what' 'the Jesus of the Gospels' claimed to be, and the way in which He developed and defined His claim. For the purpose of this inquiry, the question of the relation between 'the Jesus of the Gospels' and 'the Jesus of History' does not arise because we are concerned only with an alleged contradiction between the Gospels as they stand.

Here, as before, it will be well to begin with St. Mark. Only we must premise that the Evangelist did not set out to write a 'Life of Jesus' in the modern sense of the term. He makes no attempt to collect and record ordinary biographical details, or to illustrate the personal characteristics of the Master. His interest is concentrated on the separate scenes as they follow one another. There is no evidence that he stood far enough away from the Personality of Jesus to see it as a whole. His story speaks for itself. His readers are left to draw out for themselves its dogmatic implications. At the same time he writes, as St. Peter his master was accustomed to teach, as a Christian for Christians, who had been baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and to whom the general outline of the life was already familiar. For them, as for him, the gospel of the Kingdom had become the gospel of Jesus Christ.

St. Mark's account of the ministry begins with the appearance of Jesus in Galilee after the Baptist had been 'delivered up,' 'proclaiming the gospel of God.' Jesus has behind Him (Mk $1^{10f.}$) His experience at the Jordan. He had heard the Voice of God saying to Him, 'Thou art my son, the beloved, in thee I am well pleased.'

In my first paper I gave my reasons for believing that Jesus in preparation for His Baptism had shared with the Baptist what I am glad to see that Dr. Rawlinson[1] recognizes as His 'profoundly original reading of the Old Testament.' If, as we saw in my article on the witness of the Baptist, Jesus felt that He had come to fulfil all the promises of God by bearing the sins of His people, if, with that intent, He consecrated Himself to death in the waters of the Jordan to bring in the Kingdom of God, and if He was taking up the rôle of the Suffering Servant on His way to the throne of the Messiah, this voice from heaven, combining as it does both the prophetic strains, must have been for Him a direct assurance that He had rightly interpreted the message of the Scriptures, as well as a public commission to undertake the task so marked out for Him. St. Mark himself is not directly interested, after his opening sentence, in the fulfilment of prophecy, so it is not surprising that he should not call attention to this aspect of the meaning of the words. It is enough for him that we should know from the first that Jesus had received from God direct assurance of His Divine Sonship.

This relationship, we must admit, does not often come to the surface in his narrative. Even the use of the title 'Father' for God is singularly rare. Jesus only once speaks of God as 'His Father' in this gospel (8^{38}), and only once speaks of Him to His disciples as 'your Father' (11^{25}). Still the fact of Sonship is presupposed throughout. Jesus claims to be differentiated from all the prophets who had preceded Him by virtue of His relation as 'beloved son' to the Lord of the Vineyard (12^{8}; cf. 1^{11}). He accepts the title 'Son' in connexion with Messiahship in answer to the challenge of the High Priest. He sets 'the Son' above angels in close relation with the Father (13^{32}). And, when His soul is stirred to its inmost depths in the garden of Gethsemane He cries again and yet again, 'Abba, Father' (14^{36}). Mr. Middleton Murry, therefore, in his *Life of Jesus* is fully justified in treating this filial consciousness towards God as the key to St. Mark's whole account of the ministry of Jesus.

We must not, however, forget that Divine Sonship cannot be dissociated from Messiahship. The Son promised to David was to be in an especial sense 'the Son of God'—a sense which implied in the judgment of Jesus, as His appeal[2] to Ps 110 shows, a mysterious personal superiority to His royal ancestor. He was the root as well as the offspring of David. At the same time the relationship was not one which destroyed His sense of kinship with His fellow-men. His Father in heaven was their Father also. And of any one who was willing to enter with Him on the path of filial obedience to the will of God, He was prepared to say, 'the same is my brother and sister and mother' (3^{35}).

We may pass on now to consider how this filial consciousness expressed itself in word and deed. In outward form the work of Jesus in His public ministry, as St. Mark pictures it, though he records curiously little of His actual teaching, was pro-

[1] *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, p. 47.

[2] Mr. Middleton Murry's confident reliance on Mk 12^{37}, as involving a direct repudiation of Davidic descent, is wrecked on the fact that St. Paul, who knew James, the Lord's brother, asserts that Jesus was 'of the seed of David after the flesh' (Ro 1^{3}; cf. 2 Ti 2^{8}).

phetic. He came 'preaching' as a fully accredited messenger or herald from the Lord. He knew on the strength of Is 61[1] (cf. Lk 4[18]) that He had been anointed to bring good news of God to men. The content of the good news that was to crown 'the voice of him that cried in the wilderness' was to be 'Behold your God' (Is 40[9]), or, as further defined in Is 52[9], 'Thy God reigneth.' The glad tidings were to be, as St. Matthew describes them, 'glad tidings of the kingdom.' St. Mark's summary of the earliest Galilean Gospel is in perfect harmony with this. 'The time is fulfilled. The kingdom of God has drawn near. Repent and believe in the power of the glad tidings' (1[15]).

At the back of this simple proclamation of the gospel, there lay, as I have already hinted, a claim to authority. No one could make such a proclamation unless He claimed to be speaking in God's Name. And Jesus, as His own words show (9[34]), was conscious of a mission, which implied an especially close link with God who sent Him. The Baptist also, whom St. Matthew credits with a closely similar pronouncement (Mt 3[2]), claimed a Divine commission. There is, however, this deeply significant difference between the two. John, though in the judgment of Jesus he was the greatest of the prophets, yet remained to the end outside the Kingdom. Jesus proclaims its advent from within. The advent of the Kingdom is for Him already a *fait accompli*. He declares expressly that a new era in human history has begun, the ripe fruit of an age-long preparation. The experience of nineteen centuries acclaims the truth of this intuition.

Even if we grant, however, that Jesus came, as the words imply, declaring in God's Name the advent of the Kingdom as one who was already a member of it, we have still to ask what this membership of the Kingdom meant. For the thought of this Kingdom of God is no less manifold than the thought of the Christ. The root idea of it would seem to be a sphere in which the will of God can express itself freely without let or hindrance from rebellious wills. In this sense the Kingdom of God did come on earth, when Jesus gave Himself up to God in the Jordan to do His will, that He might be an instrument in His hand for spreading the Kingdom among men.

If this be so, we can understand in the light of the link that, as we have seen, connects spiritual Sonship with obedience to the will of God (3[35]), why the good news of God which Jesus brought to men took shape, not in any attempt to describe the glory and the prerogatives of Divine Sonship, but in a call to accept the glad tidings of the accessibility of the Kingdom, and to return in heart and mind to God. For the nature of that Kingdom could be known only by those who would do what Jesus had done. They must take the yoke of the Kingdom upon themselves, and in the Spirit of Sonship enter into the eternal life,[1] the life of the New Age, by doing the will of their Father in heaven.

To do this in its fullness must, however, be beyond their power, until they, too, had been baptized with the spirit of Sonship. It was not enough, therefore, simply to preach the advent of the Kingdom. Men must be led to long after and to lay hold of that Spirit. Jesus was under no delusion as to the difficulty of the task thus laid upon Him. He had consecrated Himself to death for its achievement. He had come, and knew that He had come, to give His life a ransom for many (Mk 10[45], Is 53[12]). It was no light thing to get men to put away their sins and to turn to God.

On the other hand, God *is* our Father. The eternal life *is* our true life. It was possible by living that life in human flesh and blood in the sight of man to make some at least conscious of spiritual capacities as yet undeveloped, and so to arouse in them a hunger and thirst after righteousness. It was possible to express in human language the inner secrets, the fundamental laws of life in the Kingdom (4[11]), in forms which those who had ears to hear might learn to interpret. It was possible not only to reveal in act the powers of the age to come by delivering the oppressed from bondage, whether spiritual or physical, but also to train those, who were admitted to share with Him in this work, to understand the faith in God that was the condition of its effectiveness, both in the instrument and in the recipient of the deliverance (9[23. 29]).

Side by side, therefore, with His preaching in the synagogues the Evangelist shows us Jesus at work gathering around Him an inner circle of personal disciples, whose education and training absorbs more and more of His attention from the time that the opposition of the religious leaders of the people had been hardened into murderous hate by His open defiance of their traditional rules of Sabbath observance (3[6]).

The call to discipleship was in some cases direct.

[1] It is interesting to notice that in St. Mark 'entering into life' or 'having eternal life' is more than once treated as equivalent to 'entering into the kingdom' (Mk 9[43. 45], cf. 9[47]; 10[17. 30], cf. 10[23. 25]).

It involved a sharp severance of old ties. Fishermen left their nets, the tax-collector his office, to join the company of Jesus in response to a personal invitation. The prospect that He held out before them was to become 'fishers of men.' When the invitation is broadcast, stringent conditions are laid down defining the completeness of the self-surrender required of those who would enter on the relationship. This passage ($8^{34ff.}$), which comes at a turning-point in the ministry, should help us to realize that the gathering of disciples round a teacher, which in itself is so natural as to seem commonplace, had unique features about it. Is there any other instance of a teacher, who on his own showing is on his way to public execution, demanding of those who feel drawn to follow him a complete surrender of all self-will, and a readiness to sacrifice all personal ties, and even life itself for his sake, and for the sake of the message with which he was charged? Was there ever any one before His time who could stand up to Death and defy its power for himself and for all who followed him, not in the heroism of despair, but in the quiet confidence of assured mastery? It is not out of character that one who could do that should look forward to coming in the glory of His Father with the Holy Angels, and warn a disciple tempted to disloyalty that he would find himself face to face with his Lord on the day when the secrets of all hearts are revealed.

At the same time it is noteworthy that Jesus required no specific confession of faith in Himself from His disciples before He appointed them. It was enough that they were prepared to join His company. This dispensing with any initial credal test did not come, as we shall see, from any hesitation as to the importance of a clear understanding of His Person and of the office that He had come to fulfil. It came from the fact that the only road to such knowledge lay through loyal discipleship. Only a life in personal touch with Him could give a real content to their thoughts about Him.

Jesus does not, even in the first stage of their discipleship, speak directly about Himself to His disciples. When He has to speak of Himself in any official capacity He calls Himself 'the Son of Man.' For instance, they must have heard Him claim authority as 'Son of Man' to forgive sins (2^{10}), and to be Lord even of the Sabbath. The title had manifold associations in the Old Testament, but it was not in common use as specifically Messianic. It was therefore free from distracting misconceptions, and the disciples and common people alike might be left to grow in their apprehension of its significance, as He applied it to Himself now in one connexion and now in another.

The second stage in discipleship began at Cæsarea Philippi. The express challenge to the disciples to put their faith into words reveals unmistakably the goal which He had had in view all through. There were, no doubt, many earthly elements in the faith and hope and love that inspired Simon Peter's confession, 'Thou art the Christ.' Yet the root of the matter must have been in it. The opposition of the religious leaders was known to be irreconcilable. Jesus had rejected the sovereignty which the undisciplined enthusiasm of the common people would have thrust upon Him. To confess Him as Christ implied, therefore, at least a conviction that God had sent Him, and was on His side, so that His triumph was assured in spite of all that men could do to prevent it.

In any case, Jesus accepts the confession, though He bids the disciples abstain for the present from any public use of this title.

A new stage in discipleship begins, marked by quite plain teaching about Himself and the path of suffering by which He must enter into His glory. But His words found no entrance into their understanding. The thought of a crucified Christ was literally inconceivable to them. Simon Peter ventures at first to remonstrate, and is met by a stern rebuke. After that, though the disciples admittedly failed to understand, they were afraid to ask Him. They followed Him to Jerusalem under an oppressive sense of an approaching crisis, which the promise of an equally inconceivable Resurrection failed to relieve. In one of the accounts (Lk 18^{31}) Jesus gave a hint, as later in the Garden of Gethsemane (14^{49}; cf. 9^{12}), that the path was defined in Holy Scripture. But it was impossible to relieve their perplexity by anything that He could say. Nothing but the event itself could enlighten them.

For the present, however, the certainty of a coming triumph was stronger than the vague fear engendered by these mysterious warnings. And the inner harmony of the Twelve was disturbed again and again by wranglings about precedence in the Kingdom, which are memorable for us because they led first to a revelation of the Divinity of the childlike (9^{37}; cf. 10^{14}); and then of the dignity of service, finding its ultimate expression in atoning sacrifice ($10^{43ff.}$).

At last came the entry into Jerusalem amid the hosannas of the Galilean pilgrims, who were going up with Him to the Passover. Jesus does nothing to repress this sudden outburst of popular en-

thusiasm. Indeed, He deliberately gave the incident the character of the Royal Progress defined in Zec 9^9. He was coming into His Capital as the Anointed Son of God to claim His inheritance meekly but firmly.

His first act was to cleanse the Temple, denouncing the authorities as lawless usurpers. When challenged for His credentials, He appealed to the witness of the Baptist. He then laid bare the whole situation in the Parable of the Vineyard and the Husbandmen, defining his own relation as 'the beloved Son' of the Lord of the Vineyard, both to the prophets who had preceded Him and to the usurping husbandmen who had already decreed His destruction. He adds a solemn warning of the ultimate issue of their rebellion. He takes for granted, we must notice, not only that the authorities at Jerusalem knew of the Baptist's testimony to Him, but also that they had definitely refused to acknowledge the authority that He claimed in accordance with it, and had decided to put Him to death. Could He have passed such a judgment on men whom He had never met face to face, and who had never been directly confronted with His claim?

For the time being Jesus was protected by the support of the common people. So the rulers set to work to undermine His popularity, not unsuccessfully, by raising the question of tribute to Cæsar. He sets them in return the problem of the son of David who was also David's Lord—a problem which, if they had faced it, might have saved them from condemning Him for blasphemy when His trial came.

Then, after a stern denunciation of Pharisaism, He retired from the Temple, and in answer to a question foretold its destruction in that generation, describing in apocalyptic language the signs of the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds that would be the spiritual force at the back of that destruction.

In the last stage of His intercourse with His disciples we may note especially (1) the hint that He gave of a coming world-wide extension of the gospel (14^9; cf. 13^{10}): (2) the longing for an intimate and abiding communion with them through the sacrifice that He was offering that found expression in His words with regard to the Bread and Wine at the Last Supper: and (3) the evidence that is given by the prayer to His Father in Gethsemane of the reality and distinctness of His human will.

It only remains to call attention to the one utterance on the Cross recorded by St. Mark. Experience shows that this is liable to tragic misconception. The words themselves, 'My God, my God, why didst thou forsake me?' are of course a quotation from Ps 22. They express a 'dark night of the soul' of unimaginable intensity through which the Sufferer had passed, when He drank to the dregs a cup of which, at least in imagination, the inspired writer had drunk before Him. But for Jesus, as for the Psalmist, the suffering was over before it could find relief in words. So far from being a cry of disillusionment and despair, His words are the opening words of a poem which has an even more indefeasible right than Tennyson's *In Memoriam* to be regarded as 'One of the most victorious songs that ever poet chanted.' His hope was deep-rooted in the living God, and it did not disappoint Him.

On this note ends the revelation that Jesus gave of Himself in the course of His public ministry, so far as we can infer it from the material provided by St. Mark. It will be well before we close to recall the path along which we have been led.

St. Mark has shown us how Jesus, declared by the Voice from heaven to be Son of God, at once the royal Messiah and the Suffering Servant of the Lord, came preaching the Kingdom of God as a present reality from within. Entrance into that Kingdom comes through obedience to the Will of God, and implies sharing in the Divine Sonship. This obedience can only be rendered as a result of the baptism with the Holy Spirit, which was to be the characteristic work of the mightier than John. The work of the earthly ministry of Jesus was to prepare men for this baptism, by drawing together a body of disciples, who could learn something, as it were from outside, of the laws of life in the Kingdom, and of the powers of the age to come, by living in close personal touch with one who was already within the Kingdom. They were left to form a judgment for themselves from the things that they heard and saw as to the nature and person of their Master. His claim on their loyalty and devotion was absolute. Their faith, when challenged, crystallized into the confession of His Messiahship for which He had been working all along. They had learnt to believe that He had indeed come from God to be the promised Prince and Deliverer.

They were then ripe for the revelation of the Cross. And, though they failed to apprehend the meaning of His words at the time, He went up at their head to deliver His final challenge to the authorities at Jerusalem, and to face the death that, as He knew from the Scriptures, was awaiting Him at their hands.

He denounces them for refusing to accept Him as a fully accredited messenger from God: and is condemned for claiming 'to be the Christ, the Son of the Blessed,' the living head of the New Order, seen by Daniel in his vision of the Son of Man. He dies, quoting the opening words of a Psalm in which the bitterest agonies of the Passion are transfigured by the joy of a triumphal deliverance out of the very jaws of death.

Such, as far as I can decipher it, is the sequence of facts, as St. Mark conceives them, concerning His declaration of Himself whether as 'Messiah' or as 'Son of God.' It is not quite so clear-cut as the view put forward by Lord Charnwood. But it goes deeper and takes into account a wider range of facts. I propose in a later article to compare with this sequence the self-revelation of Jesus as it is presented to us in the Gospel according to St. John.

Literature.

ST. PAUL.

If St. Paul was neglected or undervalued in previous ages, certainly our age is making reparation. The books on Paul's life and teaching come steadily from the press. We have noticed several in recent months, and now we have two more, one at least of particular interest because of its author. There is a story about Jowett to the effect that he once went to hear Howson preach, and, when he was asked what he thought of him, replied, 'Conybeare must have been a very clever man.' When one reads any book by Professor F. J. Foakes-Jackson, one unconsciously murmurs, 'Lake must be a very wild fellow.' All Dr. Foakes-Jackson's books are marked by the same mental quality of balance, cool judgment, common sense, and caution. And they are all pervaded by the same adequate scholarship. If we reverse the process and go to 'The Beginnings of Christianity,' which was the joint work of Dr. Lake and Dr. Foakes-Jackson, we should be compelled to ask, 'What is Dr. Foakes-Jackson doing in this galley?'

In *The Life of Saint Paul: The Man and the Apostle* (Cape; 10s. 6d. net), we have Dr. Foakes-Jackson alone. There is a peculiar fascination about this book, peculiar because it is difficult to account for. There is not a great deal that is new in it. It goes steadily on from point to point, covering the whole ground, and doing it quietly and effectively. But what makes the book grip the reader is that on nearly every incident or topic Dr. Foakes-Jackson has something suggestive and 'different' to say. He certainly leaves out a great deal that ordinary Lives of the Apostle contain. He has nothing about the countries Paul visited, the cities he lived in, the political situation of the world. As a matter of fact he gives us just what we want—all about Paul and what he was and did.

The closing chapters, in which the writer discusses briefly the doctrine of Paul and gives us an estimate of Paul's work, are of very great interest. To one question that is often asked: Was Paul the real founder of Christianity? he gives a decided negative. To another, Was Paul greater than Jesus? he gives an equally decided negative. 'It is profoundly untrue to say that Paul made Jesus, or even gave Him an importance He would not otherwise have had. It is a literal fact that Jesus made Paul, and the greatness of the disciple is one of the chief miracles wrought by the Master.' These are the closing words of the book. And they express the sober conservatism of a work which has its own place, and a very high place, in the Pauline literature.

The other book is an elaborate and careful treatise on Paul's teaching: *Christianity according to St. Paul*, by Professor Charles A. Anderson Scott, D.D., of the English Presbyterian College (Cambridge University Press; 12s. 6d. net). A first reading of this essay produces a very favourable impression. It is obviously the result of many years' study and reflection. Professor Scott agrees with Professor Foakes-Jackson in repudiating the theory of Paul's indebtedness to Greek influences. The Hellenistic element in Paul was slight, the Jewish element predominant. His own experience and the Old Testament are the main sources from which his doctrine came. Dr. Scott rather inclines to the belief that Paul may have seen Jesus, indeed may have been a witness of His trial. He also points out that Paul knew much more of Christ's teaching than is commonly supposed, not only because he refers definitely to our Lord's words on divorce and gives a careful account of the Supper

which came from Jesus Himself, but because Paul's whole teaching has the teaching of Jesus as a necessary background. This contention is supported in a convincing manner.

One finds with some relief that Dr. Scott will have nothing of any 'Paulinism.' In this, too, Dr. Foakes-Jackson and he are at one. Paul was not a theologian, and he had no system. The attempt to systematize his thoughts on religion is a mistake, because the thing cannot be done. But Paul has dominating thoughts, and Dr. Scott has made one of these—salvation—the ruling conception of his book. This is a term which sums up all Paul found in Christ, and it is also the aspect of the gospel which found a point of attachment to the religious needs both of the Jewish and the Pagan world. The idea and the term were widely current at the time, and Paul only made use of the term to express the content of his own experience of Christ and the gospel this gave him for the world. It was not the 'salvation' of the Greco-Oriental cults Paul had in mind, but another and greater salvation. At the same time the word and the thing gave Paul scope for expressing his own message. And it is this message Dr. Scott proceeds to expound in this excellent volume. He divides the subject as follows: (1) 'Salvation as a Fact of the Past,' dealing with Redemption, Justification, and Reconciliation; (2) 'Salvation: Its Appropriation, Faith'; (3) 'Salvation: As a Progressive Experience,' Life in Christ; (4) 'Salvation: Its Consummation in the Future'; and finally (5) 'Salvation: Its Author and Perfector, Christ.' Dr. Scott has conferred a great benefit on the Church by his fresh and vigorous discussion of this great theme.

THE DIVINITY IN MAN.

One of the most beautiful and enriching books that it has recently been our lot to encounter bears the above title, and is from the pen of John W. Graham, M.A., Litt.D. (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net). If the title should suggest to any one that the book is a dull theological treatise, he will be very agreeably disappointed; for though its object is to reach the truth about the oneness of God and man, it does this 'with the mental furniture of the twentieth century,' and it does it the more successfully that about half of the book is illustrative and biographical. The writer belongs to the Society of Friends, and he presents with singular attractiveness the distilled essence of their doctrine, if indeed the word doctrine be not a misnomer.

In one aspect the book is an exposition, with illustrations, of mysticism—not of the rare and giddy heights which few have scaled, but of its more pedestrian levels, and it furnishes convincing proof that mysticism is neither unpractical nor hostile to thought. Where is the Christian group that has done more for beneficence or for the higher welfare of the world than the Quakers? Essentially their secret has been the oneness of God and man; and the realization of this has, as its counterpart in worship, expressed itself in the simple service of the Meeting House, which dispenses with ritual, sacrament, and even—though not always—with hymns. In the name of this wholesome simplicity the elaborate service of the ritualistic churches is challenged and criticized. 'The Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation has gone so far as to make a god of the Bread and Wine.' And speaking of a certain celebration of the Holy Communion, Dr. Graham remarks, 'If all the degradation of personality put into words was really felt, I do not see how the suppliants could have risen from their knees at all and walked erect out of the room. Yet a cheerful jollity actually arose at the door.'

There are vivid accounts of Plotinus, George Fox, Isaac Penington, and, on a briefer scale, of others, like Swedenborg, while the book closes with a valuable chapter on Modern Mystical Poetry, dealing with Coleridge, Wordsworth, Whittier, etc. It will be news to some that 'Ruskin was in every respect a fully equipped Friend, down even to minor testimonies.' The chapter on Inspiration is an illuminating discussion, with curious illustrations drawn from the confessions of poets and others, of the subliminal consciousness. The book is written in full view of the situation to-day, when, in words that are perhaps just a shade too strong, 'organized religion is almost visibly fading into a tradition and its usefulness growing more limited'; and if its sane counsels could only be taken to heart, there would speedily be more sweetness and light in the world and in the relations of men to men.

THE FUTURE OF CHRISTIANITY.

That indefatigable editor and promoter, Sir James Marchant, who has already several volumes of concerted discussions to his credit, has never done a better thing than in his latest venture, *The Future of Christianity* (Murray; 7s. 6d. net). He has brought together in this volume a number of eminent specialists who discuss the

doctrines of the Christian religion with a special view to the probability of their continuing to be believed. What is Christianity going to be in the environment of this present age? and how is it going to fare? and how must it be restated? The editor has been extraordinarily fortunate in the men he has persuaded to contribute to the discussion. The Bishop of Gloucester (Dr. A. C. Headlam) contributes a critical Introduction, having read all the papers. Among the other writers are Dr. W. R. Matthews, whose name would give distinction to any volume, Professor A. S. Peake, Dr. F. R. Tennant, Principal Garvie, Dr. Sloane Coffin, Professor H. R. Mackintosh, Principal Wheeler Robinson, Archbishop D'Arcy (of Armagh), Dr. Sydney Cave, Canon Raven, and others. The subjects are such as these: 'The Validity of Christian Experience,' 'The Doctrine of God,' 'The Doctrine of Christ,' 'The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit,' 'The Church and the Sacraments,' 'The Nature and Authority of Scripture,' 'Eternal Life,' 'Forgiveness and Atonement,' in short, the whole round of Christian belief. The papers are unequal in value. Some of them are conventional and timid. Others are a little redundant. But on the whole we have a valuable statement of what Christians believe in a form that is not out of harmony with the prevailing ideas of our times. The essay on 'The Doctrine of Christ' would alone make the book valuable.

Dr. Headlam, in his Introduction, makes two points that are interesting and suggestive. He says, at some length, what, if our memory is not at fault, Dr. Gore has already asserted vigorously, that it is absurd to suggest that the Christian religion is to be accommodated to the prevailing philosophy of any age. For one thing, there is no prevailing philosophy. There are far more differences in science and philosophy than in religion. There is no coherent body of thought which can be described as the philosophy of our day. And for another, it is philosophy and science that change and the Christian religion that, in its essence, never changes because it is eternal truth.

The other remark of the Bishop is that this book is a portent. It is the product of men of all the churches, and is a significant indication that there is a coherent body of common and wise teaching the existence of which will make easier a common religious instruction, and will prepare the way for a united work of the churches in the evangelization of the world. The book is to be heartily welcomed on that ground and for its own merits.

SPANISH MYSTICISM.

There is good news for lovers of Mysticism. As they know to their chagrin, few fields in their wide territory lie so far out of the beaten track of ordinary wayfarers as the great mass of Spanish Mysticism. And this is doubly irritating, since those few adventurous spirits who know something of these worlds tell us with assurance that nowhere does their favourite type of religion flower and fruit more perfectly than in that climate.

Happily Professor E. Allison Peers, M.A., that untiring pioneer, is blazing a fairly broad trail for us into this virgin country. Some three years ago he gave us his 'Spanish Mysticism, a Preliminary Survey'—being selections from thirteen saints, all famous in their own country, though some of them are little read now even there, and are but dimly known beyond it.

With great boldness Professor Peers has set himself the huge task of remedying this unfortunate state of matters. He has planned an elaborate piece of first-hand scholarship—nothing less than an account of the Spanish mystics built up upon materials hitherto inaccessible, or at least, for the most part, unused, even in Spain. This great venture has made an excellent beginning with the first of two volumes entitled *Studies of the Spanish Mystics* (Sheldon Press; 18s.), and admirable studies they are. The central figure of the seven here depicted is Santa Teresa. It is a charming portrait of a most attractive personality, whose humour and quaintness and simplicity, added to her vast gifts, help to make up a very lovable and human saint. Here, too, are Ignatius of Loyola, that compelling influence on her life: and her famous disciple, St. John of the Cross, concerning whose diminutiveness she once wrote in her playful way, 'I have got my two monks, or rather my monk and a half.'

But even more helpful is the strong light thrown upon great figures who have been little more than names or shadows to us hitherto, the fiery Luis de León, or Francisco de Osuna, or the like. Professor Peers tells us that, while of a few of those he treats, such as Luis de Granada and Juan de los Angeles, monumental Spanish editions do exist, to get at most of those with whom he means to deal he has had to work in the great libraries and in those of obscure monasteries and of private houses, finding again what has been really lost. It is a great and laborious task to which he has set himself so gallantly. And our gratitude to him should be as great. This is a work which all serious students of Mysticism must possess.

TRAVELS IN AFRICA.

Though the aeroplane has traversed the vast continent of Africa from Cairo to Cape Town, and explorers have crossed it from the Indian Ocean to the Atlantic, yet there are still equatorial regions and races of which there is very little first-hand knowledge. Messrs. Seeley, Service & Co. have just added to their notable series of books of exploration two volumes dealing with different sections of tropical Africa. The first is entitled *Savage Life in the Black Sudan* (21s. net), by Mr. C. W. Domville Fife, who has written so much about his exploration work in darkest South America and has now turned his experience to account in making a series of journeys covering three thousand miles to the south of Khartoum, 'among some of the most curious, revolting, and still savage races of mankind.' He discovered, contrary to general belief that 'slave-raiding has by no means entirely ceased along the Abyssinian border or on the Arab-Negro frontier to the south of the great Nubian desert,' that native warfare between savage tribes is of frequent occurrence, that ivory raiders cause great loss of life, that there are areas to which no white man has ever been, and that there are black secret societies whose debaucheries are too awful for description. It is almost needless to add that the narrative of such an exploration is full of live interest. It is illustrated with two excellent maps and many photographs.

In the second volume, entitled *The Cliff Dwellers of Kenya* (21s. net), Mr. J. A. Massam, District Commissioner, Kenya, gives the account of an accurate observer and careful investigator of the mode of life, social system, religion, magic, and superstitions of the Elgeyo native tribe who occupy a reserve territory, into which they have been driven by hostile raids, drought, and famine to take refuge on the inaccessible ledges of precipitous mountains in the Kenya highlands. A Norwegian farmer who visited the territory told Mr. Massam that it reminded him of the wilder parts of Norway. Like some highlanders nearer home, these natives of the Kenya highlands 'look on work as an unmitigated evil, and leave as much of it as possible to their women-folk,' whose working day is from 5 a.m. till 10 p.m. But properly handled they are good labourers, as European farmers and the railway contractors have found. They have no chief or chiefs. 'Personality counts more than wealth.' Mr. Massam describes them as a healthy tribe, and yet both sexes, particularly the men, become decrepit at the age of fifty-five and even earlier. A large proportion of the babies born die at birth or a day or two later, and many of them could be saved by the medical missionary if he were available. It may be that this agency has now become available with the same notable results as in so many other parts of the mission field.

FOLKLORE.

A scholar lecturing in his classroom is well enough. But you get nearer him when he is in his slippers, and those slippers are against the mantelpiece; and he, sprawling at ease, drops all manner of unexpected things out of his mind as conversation shifts and veers to all the points of the compass. In reading *Letters on Religion and Folklore*, by the late Mr. F. W. Hasluck, M.A., the author of 'Cyzicus,' 'Athos and its Monasteries,' etc. (Luzac; 12s. 6d. net), one has the pleasant feeling one is lounging in a smoking-room with him, and that he is, now capping story with story dug out of the oddest places, now leaping to his feet to throw out for what it is worth some idea that has perhaps just occurred to him, or that, as likely, is the outcome of massed facts patiently gathered. Touch upon a legend, a myth, a curious rite, and 'that reminds me,' he says, and out tumbles some parallel, or else the explanation. And it is all so boyish, so natural, so slangy, so full of a quaint humour that the pedantic may be a little shocked. But ordinary men will rise and cluster closer to one with a mind so full, who talks so interestingly.

These letters were written to Professor Dawkins from Athens from 1914 onwards, and later, when ill-health forced him there, from France and Switzerland until the author's death. There is much more of folklore in them than of religion properly so called. But now and then he touches on the deeper things. Not the least amusing feature of the book is the naïveté of its discoveries in the Bible, and the queer corroborations and associations these call up in his mind. A medley of all kinds of information heaped together anyhow, by a lovable soul.

The Oldest Biography of Spinoza, edited by Professor A. Wolf (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net), has been issued in connexion with the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the death of the great philosopher. It is a book to charm the expert bibliographer. It contains the text in French, derived from a valuable manuscript recently found in London, of the original life of Spinoza, which was

probably written in 1677, the year of his death, by his friend and disciple, Lucas. Professor Wolf has given an English translation, with introduction and notes. He has added, besides, a considerable amount of additional biographical matter from original sources. He promises in the course of this year the issue of a new translation of Spinoza's correspondence, with introduction and notes. When this is done, Professor Wolf will have placed at the disposal of English students all the material of importance of Spinoza's biography.

Now that a fitting career must be found for daughters as well as sons, the problem that confronts them and their parents has become doubly difficult. What to do with our boys used to be the all-important question; nowadays what to do with our girls has become quite as urgent. What could be more timely, therefore, than such a volume as *The Problem of a Career*, edited by Mr. J. A. R. Cairns, one of the Metropolitan Police Magistrates, who claims that this has been solved by thirty-six men of distinction in naval, military, civil service, professional, and business life (Arrowsmith; 7s. 6d. net). He calls it an essentially practical book, and so it is. The Bishop of London deals with a young man's prospects in the Church of England. 'It is one of the most extraordinary and, at present, inexplicable facts of the present day,' he writes, 'that with so many professions, such as the Law, Medicine, and Engineering, absolutely crowded . . . the one profession which offers the most complete development of mind, body, and spirit should be at present starved for want of men.' To the young man troubled about finance, the Bishop puts the straight question—'What are you going to sell your life for?' With the full approval of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, the Rev. E. J. Mahoney, D.D., deals with the case of the Roman Catholic priesthood, and the Rev. Dr. Oman, Principal of Westminster College, Cambridge, states the case for the ministry of the Nonconformist churches. Earl Beatty leads off with the Navy; the article on the Army has the approval of the Secretary of State for War; that on the Air Service is similarly authenticated; the Metropolitan Police is shown to have attractions as good as anything in the Civil Service. Law, Medicine, Art, Literature, Journalism, Banking, Architecture, are all fully dealt with, whilst the longest article in the volume —that on Business—is written from the practical experience of the Managing Director and Chairman of the Board of J. Lyons & Co. Ltd. In point of style there is nothing quite so good as Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P., on Politics and Public Life.

Another book on the subject is an admirable volume of ninety pages with the title *A 'Varsity Career*, by Mr. B. Dennis Jones, Precentor of Trinity College, Cambridge (Heffers; 3s. 6d. net). Within its limits this will also be found a most helpful book in determining the future career of the university student. Mr. Jones writes with intimate knowledge. He gives tables of costs at an Oxford or Cambridge College. The advantages of a public day school over a public boarding school, he says, is a debatable subject. 'It is an interesting study to compare the two types of boys, and often one is bound to confess that the home influence is the one which in the long run endures, and is the most determining. No one would desire to abolish the Public School system, but parents to-day are considering the question of Day Schools in a new light.' His advice is worth studying.

'The story of Rome is the most splendid romance in all history.' So Marion Crawford wrote almost a quarter of a century ago. It is a story that has been written many times, and the end is not yet. The latest version of the oft-told tale is entitled *Alma Roma: A Travellers' Companion to Rome*, by Mr. Albert G. Mackinnon, M.A. (Blackie & Son). A new chapter in the romance has begun in which both Pope and King are in the background and the figure of Mussolini alone holds the stage, just as in other days Machiavelli, Cavour, and Garibaldi were the popular heroes. Mr. Mackinnon thinks that Mussolini has discovered the soul of his country. He has nothing to say about his methods. He tells us that 'Fascism has given ambition a goal, and patriotism a vent.' It has saved Italy from Bolshevism, for the 'Red' flag was vaunting itself in the streets of Rome. When Mr. Mackinnon takes the traveller to the Colosseum it is not merely to show him that imposing ruin, but to endeavour to present to his imagination the actual scene of a gladiatorial show as Macaulay does and as Mark Twain does, each in his own realistic manner. If you find yourself in front of St. Peter's on a great day in Holy Week he will tell you that 'the one thing our friends will not believe or understand is that these ceremonies of the Church are religious ceremonies,' not mere spectacles for foreigners and heretics to stare at. One really does not need to go to Rome in order to find Mr. Mackinnon's book most interesting and instructive reading, and as entertaining as any romance. Moreover, the book is accom-

panied by an excellent plan of the city and by many photographic illustrations.

A little book containing *Two Essays on the Gospel Miracles and the Atonement*, by the late Canon David Dorrity, B.D., comes from the Commonwealth Press (2s. 6d. net). It is worth getting and reading. Canon Peter Green writes an introduction in which he speaks in the highest terms of the late author. And we can agree about the freshness and vigour of his mind. These are admirable lectures, and well worth preserving, on great themes on which such a suggestive mind has much to say that is of real value.

A fresh volume on the Virgin Birth is always welcome if it has anything to say, and when a writer selects one particular point and explores it thoroughly and candidly he is sure to have something worth hearing. This can be said with confidence of the book, *Did Paul know of the Virgin Birth? an Historical Study*, by the Rev. Bishop Richard J. Cooke, D.D., L.H.D. (Epworth Press; 5s. net). The writer does not deal with the main question or with the arguments for or against the belief in a Virgin Birth; at least not deliberately, though he can hardly avoid this altogether. But his main point is whether we can be sure that Paul did know of the belief. The argument has been pressed against the belief from the silence of Paul and John. The argument from silence is a dangerous one and often unreliable. And Dr. Cooke is certain that, in the case of Paul at any rate, it has no force. His argument is conducted with great ability, and seems to us to have a great deal of force. It is difficult to believe that the friend of Luke would have been ignorant of what holds so large a place in Luke's narrative. But that is a minor point, and Dr. Cooke goes much further to find his proofs.

The question of a future life and its nature is one that will always appeal to the Christian mind, but appeals to the mind of to-day with peculiar poignancy, as the number of books on the subject that are being published testifies. The real grounds of belief are for most of us Christian grounds, but the testimony of 'natural religion' has its own place, and it is this testimony that is the subject of *The Hereafter and the Undying Hope*, by the Rev. Robert H. Murray, Litt.D. (Heffer; 4s. 6d. net). Dr. Murray discusses the place of this hope in the writings and lives of the sages and philosophers throughout the ages. He examines the claim of spiritualism to give its own proof. He has a chapter on the suggestive pointer which may be found in unrealized ambition and unfinished work, and closes with a chapter on reunion in eternity, in which he strongly believes. The book is filled with the fruits of wide reading, and is the result of earnest and loving thought. It will be welcome to many wistful minds, and has a message of its own that will bring light and comfort to people of different creeds and views. It is an admirable statement of the evidence which can be found apart from a definite reliance on revealed religion.

In Time of Sorrow, by Bishop C. L. Slattery (Macmillan; $1.50), is a book which is fitted to bring real comfort to mourners. There is nothing sentimental about it. Its appeal is to the intellect as much as to the heart. The facts are bravely faced, and then with simplicity and rare wisdom the writer brings to bear upon them the grace and truth of the gospel. He does not seek to be wise overmuch, or to give precarious assurances regarding the life to come, but he has done something far better. He has written a book which will encourage and inspire mourners with the faith that 'sorrow nobly borne is man's best gift to the loving Father of mankind.'

It is characteristic of the more liberal spirit of our time that the history of the Church is reviewed dispassionately, many traditional judgments are revised, and the Church's debt to heretics is frankly acknowledged. An illustration of this may be found in *Hans Denck, 1495–1527, Humanist and Heretic*, by the Rev. Alfred Coutts, B.D., Ph.D. (Macniven & Wallace). Not that it is quite accurate to call Hans Denck a heretic, but certainly he is one whose name has long been under a cloud. He was a leader of the Anabaptists in the earlier and brighter years of their chequered history, but he renounced connexion with the movement when its revolutionary tendencies became manifest, and he died before the moral anarchy at Münster brought it to ruin. He was an impressive personality, learned, courageous, and high-minded, with a profound insight into spiritual religion. A pioneer thinker, he undoubtedly threw out ideals which 'have been of the highest possible value as a spiritual influence in the Church,' and it is well that we should have this excellent account of his life and work.

Dr. Svend Aage Pallis discusses learnedly the nature and sources of Mandæan religion in his

Mandæan Studies (Milford; 10s. 6d. net). He concludes that Mandæism was originally a Gnostic system of belief which later came under the influence of the Persian religion; it is indeed 'the best known Gnostic system, for our knowledge of other Gnostic sects is limited to their speculative myths.' The book deals fully with the central ideas of this religion—cosmology, world-process, baptism, the doctrines of the soul's journey after death, and the inhabitation of the planets by demons. At no important point is there any demonstrable connexion between Mandæism and Judaism: even the Mandæan code of morals is totally independent of the Jewish. One of the difficulties in presenting Mandæism as a system is that different trains of thought occur in it side by side. One peculiarity of it is that it possessed no sacrificial cult, another that it forbade lamentations for the dead. These and many other curious features and beliefs are presented by Dr. Pallis with great learning and ability.

A study of John Stuart Mill and his teaching, of a very thorough and independent kind, has been written by Mr. Charles L. Street, Ph.D., and published by the Morehouse Publishing Company at $1.25, under the title *Individualism and Individuality in the Philosophy of John Stuart Mill*. The point of view of the book is that the key to all Mill's teaching is the idea of individuality, and the significance of this in his political and social philosophy. The writer asks no general questions, but starts from a consideration of Mill's own problems, how he saw them and how he tried to solve them. The book is a very able and engrossing as well as original treatment of Mill's life and social teaching.

A scientific training may be a great help to a religious teacher, as the Rev. C. H. Tyndall, D.D., Ph.D., has proved in practice. His scientific knowledge has, we learn, been used often and powerfully in the exposition of religious truth. And this has suggested to him this volume, *Through Science to God* (Revell; $2.00), in which he points out the evidences of Divine activity in the processes of Nature. The book is a fascinating one merely for its scientific expositions. But it will be also to the wise user a storehouse of illustration. The sub-title of the book sums up its contents: 'Nature, a Medium in the Revelation of Spiritual Truth.' The different chapters deal successively with wireless telegraphy and all forms of radio-activity, the atom, the conservation of energy, and generally with the significance of Nature as a veil revealing the energy, wisdom, and love of the Creator. The book amply fulfils its promise of interest and usefulness.

In the 'Translations of Christian Literature' a fresh volume of the fifth series has been published —*The Life of St. Gall*, by Maud Joynt (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net). There is a learned introduction on the lives of St. Gall, on the monastery and on the famous library which survives to recall the past glories of the Abbey. The substance of the book is a translation of the 'life' by Walahfrid Strabo. The whole essay and translations are evidently a labour of love to the author, and are done with care and piety.

The practice of 'Retreats' is one that has a real place in the religious life, and ought to have a much larger place. No one who has gone into retreat at any time will be ignorant of the very great value of such a quiet time. To them, and to all contemplating such a spiritual exercise, a volume on *Retreats: Their Value, Method, and Organisation*, edited by the Rev. R. Schofield, B.A. (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d.), will be welcome. Every aspect of the subject is treated with fullness. The title indicates the contents. The different chapters are written by specialists from the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church, and the whole subject is dealt with both in its religious and its practical aspects. A very admirable and useful volume.

Quakers in Ireland, 1654–1900, by Isabel Grubb, M.A. (Swarthmore Press; 3s. 6d. net), is a valuable and interesting piece of work. No history of Irish Quakerism has been written since the publication of an early history in 1751. Recourse had, therefore, to be had to the *fontes*, in the shape of private letters and official records. These have been sifted with care and used with discretion and fine effect. The result is a most readable record of Quaker life and work, persecution, and constancy in Ireland. If there were at times absurdities in the discipline, as in the prohibition of bells on children's whistles and lace on baby linen, these were redeemed by the sterling integrity and loving service which are everywhere synonymous with the Quaker name.

The God of Love, by the Rev. Ernest Walder, M.A. (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net), is defined as 'a literary research into the origin and meaning of S. John's Epistles.' It is in many respects able and scholarly. The writer is evidently well versed in textual criticism and in the writings of the

Neo-Platonists; but his commentary, if such it can be called, is too rambling and discursive to be of much service to scholars, while it is too technical for the general reader. In a somewhat curious preface the writer explains that this work should have been preceded by a commentary on John's Gospel previously written, but whose publication 'must await the advent of the almighty dollar.' References are, however, made to this unpublished commentary in a way which would seem to indicate that the work of editing has been somewhat carelessly done.

The Index Volume of the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.

By Professor William Fulton, D.D., B.Sc., Aberdeen.

In the *Tale of a Tub* it is written, 'The most accomplished way of using books at present, is twofold: Either, first, to serve them as some men do Lords, learn their titles exactly, and then brag of their acquaintance; or, secondly, which is indeed the choicer, the profounder, and politer method, to get a thorough insight into the index, by which the whole book is governed and turned, like fishes by the tail. For to enter the palace of learning at the great gate, requires an expense of time and forms; therefore men of much haste and little ceremony are content to get in by the back-door.'

The satire has not lost its point for our time. People glibly discuss books with which they have not even a nodding acquaintance, and mere 'indical' reading is not unknown, even among reviewers. But abuse of the index is no argument against its use. From early times the value of the index has been recognized; and, though it may be a long time yet before Mr. H. B. Wheatley's vision is realized, of a book without an index being as rare as a book without a title-page, the index has in recent years been coming into its own. One would hardly subscribe to the opinion that omission of an index should be treated as a legal offence, and that the offender should not only be fined but deprived of his privilege of copyright; but it is now generally agreed that where an index is essential for the full use of a book, it ought to be provided. As Thomas Fuller said, 'Though the idle deserve no crutches (let not a staff be used by them but on them), pity it is the weary should be denied the benefit thereof, and industrious scholars prohibited the accommodation of an index.'

In our days the art of indexing is being diligently cultivated, and is being applied—as witness the goodly volume before us—even to encyclopædias. The indexer, too, is held in higher honour than formerly. His task, largely mechanical as it necessarily is, is no longer regarded as menial; it makes great demands, as is freely conceded, upon intelligence and skill. Macaulay's 'index-makers in ragged coats of frieze' have disappeared with the coffee-houses they frequented.

It must be welcome news to the fortunate owners of the Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics that the Index Volume has now been published. At the same time it should be a vast encouragement to prospective owners of the Encyclopædia to acquire now, without further hesitation, the whole completed work. With the publication of the Index Volume, the usefulness of the Encyclopædia has been doubled, nay, even trebled; indeed for some it has been multiplied beyond measure. For an Index to the Encyclopædia has been a very real need.

The objection was once urged against the indexing of the tenth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, that it was but 'making an index to an index.' None the less the tenth edition, like the ninth, was indexed, and the eleventh edition too. The Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics is itself an index in the same sense, its articles being carefully mapped out and alphabetically arranged. In another sense also it had an index before this Index Volume appeared. To the longer articles a table of contents is often prefixed; usually too there are paragraphic headings; and further, as the volumes succeeded each other, the cross-references increased in number. None the less the imperative need of an index, in the usual sense, remained.

The Index Volume has been dedicated to the memory of James Hastings, 'whose life's work

was completed in this Encyclopædia.' This dedication serves in itself to mark the high importance of the Index Volume, and in any case no other dedication would have been fitting. The Encyclopædia was not only the *magnum opus*, but the crowning achievement, of that great bookman, that prince among editors. It is a noble and enduring monument to his genius, courage, assiduity, and steadfast patience; and it will send his name down the generations.

As we have recalled Dr. Hastings as an editor, we may be allowed also to dwell for a moment on the kindly human relations he forged between himself and those he enlisted in the great enterprise—in which he was so ably assisted by Professor J. A. Selbie. One of his compensations in his arduous labours was, as he himself acknowledged, that thereby he made many friendships. It was interesting to observe, let us add, how he combined firmness and tact in his negotiations with the tardy; he never showed himself a taskmaster, lifting an inexorable whip, but only a sympathetic friend and brother, himself hard pressed by a hidden, relentless hand!

We gather from the Preface to volume twelve (dedicated most appropriately to Sir John Maurice Clark, Baronet, 'Publisher and Friend') that Dr. Hastings had planned the production of an Index. In fact, as Miss Hastings tells us in the Preface to the Index Volume, he directed the work on the Index for nearly a year before his death.

Let us turn now to the Index Volume itself. It is not an Index in the fuller sense of the term. That is, it does not offer an arranged analysis or *précis* of the contents of the Encyclopædia. It was in this sense that Isaac D'Israeli must have used the term in his tribute to the inventor of 'the little supplement': 'I know not to whom to yield the preference, either to Hippocrates, who was the first great anatomiser of the human body, or to that unknown labourer in literature who first laid open the nerves and arteries of a book.' But it is not the 'nerves and arteries' of the Encyclopædia that are here laid open. That would have meant work to fill several volumes; and needless work too, where so largely the authors are themselves 'anatomisers.' What the Index Volume seeks to do is to show precisely where the several 'nerves and arteries' are to be found; and this it does not only systematically but in minutest detail, in seven hundred and fifty-seven triple-columned pages (so clearly printed and so effectively spaced that it is an actual pleasure to consult them). In short, the Index Volume provides an index in the narrower sense of an arranged list or table of contents for detailed reference.

The Index is of course arranged alphabetically; and it is in one alphabet, in this respect differing from the indexes of many Continental books. No doubt Dr. Hastings considered the advisability of drawing up separate indexes for proper names and subjects, or even for names of persons and places, titles of books, and subjects; but he wisely decided against dividing the Index. Yet at the same time reference to the entries has been greatly facilitated by the printing of the headings, where they are proper names and subjects, in capitals, and where they are titles of books, in italics. Another device for facilitating reference is to show the entry in Clarendon type where there is an article on a particular subject, or where in the case of the larger subjects there is an article under a subdivision.

It has been said that a good indexer is 'born *and* made.' This must surely be true of the two signally capable indexers on Dr. Hastings' editorial staff, namely, Mrs. Mary C. Laburn, M.A., and Mrs. D. R. Dow, M.A. (wife of Professor John Dow of Knox College, Toronto), two sisters, both of them distinguished students of the University of St. Andrews, who after four years' devoted toil have compiled this really magnificent Index. More than labour and resolution and patience have gone to the making of it; with gifted workers like these it has been no mere 'beating the track of the alphabet,' as Dr. Johnson phrased it. For such a work as they have produced, insight and penetration were required, and analytical power and critical judgment. For it is to be remembered that the Encyclopædia is a survey not merely of names and facts but of abstract ideas.

There are two obvious tests of a good index. The first is conciseness. Where it is an index in the larger and fuller sense above indicated, conciseness is a high art; and even where, as in this case, it is an index in the narrower sense, conciseness is far from being easily achieved. Yet this Index has achieved it, and achieved it consistently; not a word appears to be wasted. The other obvious test is correctness. Now it is in the remotest degree improbable that no errors have crept into an Index containing (on a rough and rapid computation) some two hundred thousand entries, but even a brief scrutiny of this volume imparts a feeling of confidence. One quickly gains the impression that the indexers have fulfilled their laborious task with that passion for accuracy which inspired Dr. Hastings himself: 'An Encyclopædia,' he once remarked, 'which cannot be trusted in matters of fact is not worth publishing.'

Personally we are looking forward to using the Index, and we grudge spending time merely in checking its accuracy. But in order to satisfy our reviewer's conscience we have checked the entries in a score or two of cases, and have invariably found them to be correct. Once only did we pause over an entry. It was when we saw the name of Plotinus under the heading 'Trinity (Christian),' and discovered it was put there because Augustine in the most famous chapter of the *Confessions* closely imitated the fine passage in the *Enneads* in which Plotinus urges us to the holy quest of the Universal Soul (the Third Person in the Neo-Platonic Trinity). On second thoughts we were willing to allow that the entry could be justified; only it might have been well to add it to the entry under the heading 'Trinity, Triads' which refers to Plotinus.

It should be also said that in addition to the exhaustive general Index there is an Index to Foreign Words, with each language in a separate alphabet, as well as an Index to Scripture Passages and a List of Authors, with the titles of their contributions. It may serve as a reminder of the scope of the Encyclopædia, which aims at giving an account of religion and ethics—every separate religious belief or practice, every separate philosophical and ethical idea or custom—in all ages and in all countries, simply to record the languages principally named in the Index to Foreign Words: African, American, Arabic, Armenian, Australian, Babylonian-Assyrian, Celtic, Chinese, Egyptian, Finn, Greek, Hebrew, Indian, Indo-Chinese, Italian, Japanese, Latin, Melanesian and Polynesian, Persian, Siberian Races, Slavic, Teutonic, Tibetan, Turkish. The list of Indian words is by far the longest; then come the Latin and the Greek lists, which are about equal in length.

When Dr. Hastings projected the Encyclopædia he thought of it as a book for the teacher, 'whether occupying the pulpit or the platform, the chair of the professor, or the desk of the author and editor.' When he had published the Encyclopædia and projected the Index Volume, he thought of the Encyclopædia more and more as a book for the student. It was his hope and intention through the Index Volume not only to make the Encyclopædia easier of access as a work of occasional reference, but in particular to open it up fully for the purposes of systematic study.

'When we inquire into any subject,' said Dr. Johnson, 'the first thing we have to do is to know what books have treated of it. This leads us to look at catalogues and the backs of books.' So that, as we may be allowed to conjecture, Dr. Johnson did not despise the 'back-door' method on which, as we saw at the outset, Swift waxed satirical. And the Index Volume under review furnishes the humble student with a gateway to 'the palace of learning' suitable to his mental state and condition.

'Under general headings,' to quote from the Preface to the Index Volume, 'such as "Church History," "Ethics," "Philosophy," "Religion," and "Sects," to name a few out of many, will be found grouped all related articles in their alphabetical order. This will enable those desirous of following out certain courses of study to find the material at a glance, and see their subject within the perspective of a vast yet minutely mapped field of research.'

Or consider the use of the grouped references as distinguished from the grouped articles in the Index Volume. Suppose, for example, the student is interested in anthropology and primitive religion—as we are in a modest way—and suppose he has been attracted in the course of his reading by some casual references to the Ainus, he will be delighted to discover—as we discovered only a few minutes ago—that not only is there a long article on the Ainus, but there are numerous references to them throughout the Encyclopædia. Or it may be that he is interested in primitive beliefs and practices generally rather than in particular tribes or peoples; a great field of comparative study lies before him when he has looked up the entries under, say, 'Ancestor-worship,' 'Cosmology,' or 'Initiation.' Or perhaps it is not so much primitive culture as some great historical faith that interests him, whether because of its rivalry or as affording an instructive parallel to Christianity, or for its impact upon Christianity in history; let him consult, say, 'Buddhism,' 'Muhammadanism,' or 'Zoroastrianism' in the Index Volume, and he will find references to special articles and, in the first two instances at least, hundreds of other references (all concisely defined).

Or suppose that the student's special studies are in Christian doctrine. If he is considering a single great doctrine such as the 'Trinity,' or the 'Incarnation,' or the doctrine of 'Salvation,' he has but to consult the Index Volume under these headings, and he is at once provided both with a great body of historical and constructive material from within the domain of Christian theology, and with an ample and suggestive setting for these doctrines in the science of comparative theology. We remember well the pains we recently took to

trace the Trinitarian or Triadic conception in the ethnic religions, and we should have been saved our pains had the Index Volume been accessible to us.

But one might multiply instances indefinitely. Let us simply cite, almost at haphazard, certain important headings by means of which the student will be led to find a rich reward: 'Augustine' and 'Calvin'; 'Communion' and 'Mystery-Religions'; 'Asceticism,' 'Mysticism,' and 'Socialism'; while if his subject is general philosophy he may turn to 'Aristotle' or 'Plato,' to 'Kant' or 'Spinoza,' and steep himself in the mind of a great master.

Some time ago I had occasion to express my sense of the value of the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. I said, 'Following upon my acquisition of the Encyclopædia came the inevitable regret that I had not acquired it sooner, while still in the parochial ministry. I now make more use of it than of any other similar work. To see its handsome volumes on my shelves is itself a solid delight; to consult their pages a real and unfailing satisfaction.' And I added, 'I would recommend it most cordially not only to teachers of religion and philosophy and to Christian preachers, but also to all who would find to their hand an effective instrument for the exploration of the world's thought on the things of the human spirit.' I now add, that the effectiveness of the Encyclopædia has been manifoldly increased, for me at least, with the appearance of the Index Volume.

Present-Day Faiths.

Unitarian Christianity.

BY THE REVEREND S. H. MELLONE, M.A.(LOND.), D.Sc.(EDIN.), LONDON.

THE historic sources of the Unitarian movement in modern times are to be found in the upheaval produced by the Protestant Reformation. The early Unitarians were Protestants of the Protestants. Heretical opinion on the subject of the Trinity, in the various forms which it took at this period, represented and rested upon a thoroughgoing appeal to the Bible as against the authority of man-made creeds. The difference between the early Unitarians and their orthodox Protestant opponents was not as to the authority of Scripture, but as to what beliefs were warranted by Scripture and what were not. Their 'anti-trinitarianism' and other apparent negations referred only to doctrines which are not to be found in the Bible or which they believed to be inconsistent with the character of God as revealed therein. The Trinity was for them only one case (though the most conspicuous case) of this general principle. They took their stand passionately on the written Word; but they read it with entire mental and spiritual independence, in the light of reason and conscience alone.

This is our spiritual heritage; but to-day it compels us to seek for the things of God not only within the pages even of this unique written record of man's religious experience. The authority of the Bible has been profoundly affected by historical and literary criticism. What, then, remains? Only this, as James Martineau contended, in his last great work, that the Sources of Religion, once found in infallible persons and infallible books, must now be sought for in Human Nature itself. We must throw ourselves back on the Reason and Conscience of Mankind.

For this cause, the Unitarian movement involves a strong development of independence and freedom of thought, which occasionally leads to mere eccentricities or vagaries on the part of individuals or groups, in no sense typical or representative.

Nevertheless, there is in this movement a central main stream of tendency, of which we may say, *this* is what the movement really represents. Its adherents refuse to stand outside the Christian tradition. Unitarianism is no abstract monotheism. It is no 'lowest common factor' of Judaism, Muhammadanism, Buddhism, or other religions. It is *Unitarian Christianity*—the Unitarian version of the Christian religion. What, then, distinguishes Unitarian Christianity from other types of Christianity? The answer is this. We take the time-honoured distinction between *the essential* and *the non-essential*, and apply it to the problems of faith so radically and thoroughly as to create a distinctive

outlook on religion. The non-essential is not necessarily false: it is not despised or rejected: it is to be understood, valued, used—for what it is worth: but it is never to be used as the essential is used.

Unitarian Christianity tries to meet the religious need of our day by claiming the right to exercise even the most drastic historical and scientific criticism on the material of the Christian tradition. Why? In order to penetrate through and grasp *the essential principles distinctive of that tradition*, and proclaim them for what they really are—the pure essence of vital religion; and we find these essentials set forth in the message pervading the first three Gospels: the great argument from human goodness to Divine goodness, carrying with it the Fatherhood of God, and the Brotherhood of Man, not merely as sounding phrases or glowing visions, but as an experience to be realized and a task to be achieved.

The Fatherhood of God is the essence of the Galilean gospel. Jesus of Nazareth, so far as our knowledge goes, first made of the Fatherhood of God not merely an idea but a force in life. It is the influence of His personality and teaching that makes the New Testament to-day the richest mine of moral inspiration and insight that has been given to the world. In confessing the ideals which are central in the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, we acknowledge His leadership. But the philosophical interpretation of what that leadership implies in reference to His personality—and it is this kind of interpretation which largely occupies the historic creeds of Christendom—this, we affirm, is for religion not primary but secondary. The declaration that *Jesus is God* is rejected by Unitarians as being historically false and philosophically inconceivable. At the best it can only be understood in the Ritschlian fashion as a 'judgment of value'; and then it leaves room for interpretations as many and various as are the ways in which the Central Figure in the Gospels makes His appeal to the souls of men. The opposite declaration, that *Jesus is a mere man*, if the expression has any definite meaning at all, implies a view of human nature opposed to every principle of the teaching of Jesus Himself. If God is 'our Father,' there is no such thing as a 'mere man.' And this is not in the least inconsistent with a profound reverence for Jesus as our Master in spiritual things or with the communal expression of this feeling in recognized ways.

'What think ye, then, of Christ?' The question was never more vital than it is to-day. A typical Unitarian answer is given in the words of Theodore Parker's hymn:

O Thou great Friend to all the sons of men,
Who once appeared in humblest guise below,
Sin to rebuke, to break the captive's chain,
And call Thy brethren forth from want and woe.

We look to Thee: Thy truth is still the light
Which guides the nations, groping in their way,
Stumbling and falling in disastrous night,
Yet hoping ever for the perfect day.

Yes, Thou art still the Life; Thou art the Way
The holiest know; Light, Life, and Way of heaven!
And they who dearest hope, and deepest pray,
Toil by the Light, Life, Way, which Thou hast given.

This is a confession of the religious value of Jesus; it is an acknowledgment of His leadership. But a Christology as a formed and fixed theological conception, as it were a *definition* of the personality and power of Jesus, is a conception of another kind. It raises questions of history, psychology, philosophy. It cannot belong to the things which are for religion essential.

It is the living manifestation of goodness in the personality itself, the visible comprehensible ideal of Godlike manhood, which lays hold of men's hearts, and awakens the smouldering spark of their better self. When goodness is set forth not merely as a law that commands but as a living reality and life-giving force, we feel how much it is to be desired, and willing surrender to it is no longer a burden but a joy. It is this that appeals as by a saving hand to the man whose courage has departed from him and who despairs of himself: this, that by the unselfish force of its forgiveness, help, and healing, arouses faith in the Divine Love which conquers all and forgives all: this, that by its example of persistent faithfulness gives courage to the weak and inspires him with confidence to arise and enter on a new life. Of this grand and universal truth Jesus becomes the revealer, not by being an exceptional personage who could be a rule or example for nothing, but *by being a signal instance of it so intense and impressive as to set fire to every veil that would longer hide it.*

I have already touched on the fact that in the case of the movement known as Unitarian its past history has stamped certain characteristics on its life. Our fathers were forced into exile by exclusion from the larger historic Churches of Christendom; and this, together with our subsequent denominational history, has infused a certain habit of mind. It is the habit of independent judgment,

of bringing opinions to the bar of a sturdy common sense, of proving all things and holding fast that which is good. The men trained in these congregations have learnt to think reverently, but to trust their own reason and stand on their own feet.

The consciousness of all this points to the reason why Unitarians, to a greater extent apparently than some larger bodies of Christians, are keenly sensitive to the manifold influences of modern science, psychology, and sociology, and have been able to welcome every real and assured advance in historical and scientific knowledge. In the great days of the Early Church (say in the fourth century) Christian thought was in harmony with what was then the best science of the time. Is the Christian thought of to-day in harmony with the best science of the time?

On the other hand, the ethical side of religion, problems of life and conduct, the growth of character and responsibility, arouse more interest than ever in the minds of the younger generation, because they have a greater freedom of choice. True, we find much thoughtless eagerness for amusement, along with little idea of what real recreation is; we see signs showing that the edge of the sense of personal responsibility has been blunted, and the windows of the soul dulled with the dust and turmoil of life; but the windows of the soul are there. Untouched by the controversies of ecclesiastics and theologians, there are masses of people who, in their own dim, uncertain ways, are seeking under the name of social justice a larger and fuller life—some kingdom of heaven on earth to which they may belong.

Our faith is therefore in the rising vision of another Church, in whose upbuilding Unitarians believe they have their appointed part, though its life will be too vast and rich to be called by any of the names which now are familiar to our ears; a Church that will not discard the objective help of historic religion, embodied in the supreme Personality of Christ, realizing in its highest historic form the relation between God and man; a Church thus wise to gather to herself all the best truth that old times have won, but never seeking to build religion on a dogmatic theological idea, and for ever strong to watch, with forward look, for the light that is still to rise from the unspent deep things of God; a Church whose one demand of all her children is, that they shall be pure in heart, and whose worship is built on one great motive of thought and action, 'Glory to God alone!'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

On Using What We Have.[1]

'Thou gavest also thy good spirit to instruct them.'—Neh 9^{20}.

Do you still listen to the Wireless, or have you grown tired of it? Some weeks ago Mr. Baldwin was telling us some glorious sea stories, lovely yarns all about ships and fights and flashing guns. And it didn't all happen long ago in Drake's day, or when Nelson was alive. It was about men still living, who sailed out to their adventures a few years ago from Glasgow and Dundee. One captain—he was the Glasgow man, I think—had been given one gun to guard his vessel—only one, and a little thing at that. And so they sent him out upon the seas with all their perils to do the best he could. And away over among the West Indies one fine day what did he do but run slap into a German cruiser or something of that kind, with rows and rows of guns, and big ones too. He had no chance at all. So they signalled to him to surrender. 'Surrender?' said he; 'what does that queer word mean? We don't use it in Glasgow.' And he popped off his poor toy gun. And that did it. For the German opened fire, and big shells came crashing in till the deck was all ragged and in splinters, and the poor little bit of a gun was knocked out, and things had to come to an end. And when the German captain met our man, he was half furious and yet half full of admiration. 'What did you do it for, you silly idiot?' he said. 'What earthly chance had you with that pea-shooter of yours, you gallant lunatic?' 'Well,' said our sea-dog rubbing his head, 'they gave me a gun of sorts, and so I supposed they meant me to use it, and I did.'

You and I have been given heaps of things, for God hasn't sent us out with never a chance, but rigged out properly and all ship-shape with everything we need. He has given us all kinds of things;

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

and we are meant to use them. Yet, do we? You have got eyes, but do you use them; or are you one of those who never notice things? You're sprawling in a chair, reading perhaps, and some one older by far than you comes into the room, and you have to be told to get up. And that makes you feel horrid, and you blush, and grow uncomfy. For you're not really rude inside. You don't notice things in time, that's all. Or Mother is tired, and there are any number of ways that you could help her. But you never see them till you are sent. And that spoils it all. And sometimes you wish and wish you were like other boys and girls you know, who always see the thing to do and do it just as easily as a watch's hands move round. 'I never think,' you pout; 'I never see; I never notice.' Yet you were given eyes like anybody else. Why don't you use them?

Or, are you one of those restless little souls who are always in trouble? There are rows at school, and rows at home, and rows wherever you are. And you are getting a bit soured and sulky over it. For you can't help it. 'Everything always goes wrong with me,' you say. 'However well I mean, I'm sure to make a mess of it. I was only trying to be funny when I stuck a pin into Jones' leg: I didn't mean to hurt him, really; I just thought the class looked bored and dull, and that that would cheer them up a bit. And Jones! Oh, he's an old stupid. He didn't matter.' Or, 'I wasn't thinking much about it, and did say what was a little off the line. But I never meant to tell a whopper, never. I never know what's the right thing to do.' Well, but, as Nehemiah says, God has given you His good Spirit to instruct you just as surely as to anybody else. Inside you He has put that queer thing we call conscience, that keeps saying out quite clearly, 'Do it,' or, 'Don't do it.' And since God has given it to you, why don't you use it? I know a boy who was going down to Edinburgh to the Rugger International against England. He had bought his railway ticket, he had got his place in the stand, he had booked a place for lunch, he had done everything. But when the morning came, he didn't hear the alarm clock when it went off, and woke up long after the train had left. And so there was no International for him. God has given you and me an alarm clock that keeps birring, and birring, and birring. Why don't you use it?

Or again, Christ says that some people will be much surprised when He tells them that they have done very poorly with their lives. 'But,' they will stammer out, 'I was quite straight and clean and honest, and never did any one any harm.' 'But what good did you do them?' Christ will ask. 'Who was made any better or any happier by you?' 'I never had a chance of that,' they will answer. 'No chance!' Christ will reply. 'Why, you had dozens of them every day.' 'I never saw them,' they will say, 'really, I didn't.' 'Well, but,' Jesus will say, 'you were given a heart to show them to you, and it did it too. You knew what you would like others to do to you. Why didn't you do that to others, then?' There's that new fellow in school. What would you like to be done to you if you were at a strange place knowing no one? Do that to him, then, who is in a strange place and knows no one. Or, there's that girl in your street who isn't liked. What would you want others to do to you, if you were lonely and unpopular? Well, then, there is your chance. Or, there are the wee ones. If you were all tied up in your lessons, what would you want a big brother to do for you? There's your heart telling you quite clearly all about it all the time. But you won't listen. And yet God gave it to us just that we might use it. And we must.

Lines and Squares.[1]

'The integrity of the upright shall guide them: but the perverseness of transgressors shall destroy them.' —Pr 11^3.

I suppose most people have played the game of lines and squares when they were very young. Some of them find themselves doing it yet. The great Dr. Johnson always did it.

Does any one not know what it is? Why, it is this: when you go for a walk and find yourself walking on a pavement you must be ever so careful to walk in the squares and not on the lines between the stones. Because if you walk in the squares you have nothing to be afraid of, but if you step on the lines—well, you had better get off them, quick!

There is some difference as to what will happen to you if you will recklessly walk on the lines. I have consulted a number of authorities, people who know. Some were as old as ten, and none was less than five. One said, 'Goblins'll get you,' but that is out of a recitation. Another said in a very solemn voice that 'If you step on the lines you'll go through and fall down and keep on falling down and down and down for ever and ever and ever and ever.' And then she added, 'Amen.' But most agreed, and it seems settled, that 'Bears'll eat you.'

If you have read a delightful book called 'When

[1] By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Glasgow.

We Were Very Young,' you'll remember a song about this:

Whenever I walk in a London street,
I'm ever so careful to watch my feet;
And I keep in the squares,
And the masses of bears,
Who wait at the corners all ready to eat
The sillies who tread on the lines of the street,
Go back to their lairs,
And I say to them, 'Bears,
Just look how I'm walking in all of the squares!'

I don't know whether it was some wise old nurse who hit on this idea to make the children take good big steps and watch their feet; or whether children themselves invented it to make their walks like fairy tales, for in fairy tales you are all right and can do anything if you don't do one certain forbidden thing.

But if it was a nurse, she was very wise, and if it was children, they were very sensible: for there is something in it.

There are lines in the Road of Life that we must not trample upon. In the Bible God says, 'Walk *in* my statutes,' not '*on* my statutes,' and the word for statutes means 'a line.' God, in His Commandments has drawn certain lines, and we must keep inside them. In the Book of Proverbs we read, 'The integrity of the upright shall guide them: but the perverseness of transgressors shall destroy them.' Now the word which means 'integrity' comes from a root which means 'complete' or 'whole'; and the word which means 'perverseness' comes from a root which means 'to join together.' So here is something like the game of lines and squares in the Bible itself. In all things we are to be 'on the square,' as we say. If we are not, if we set our feet on the lines which God and man have set, there will be trouble for us.

But is this true? Of course it is. There is a line called 'reverence for old age.' Nobody admires a child who steps on that: in fact, in the Bible there were some children who called impudent names at the prophet Elisha, and bears got them, she-bears, too!

There are lines called 'courtesy' and 'patience,' and Dr. Johnson, though he wouldn't step on the lines on the pavement, stepped so often on these lines that people said he was an old bear, and to *be* a bear is worse than being eaten by bears.

There is a line which is written, 'Thou shalt not covet.' Judas stepped on that, and a horrible black monstrous thing called Treachery came into his heart so that he betrayed his Lord, and killed himself. Always if we trample on the Commandments of God there is some ugly result; beastly habits, brutal passions, savage tempers, animal desires, get hold of us.

So long as the lines and squares are only on the street, it is a fine game; but when the lines are on the Road of Life, the Commandments of God, and the rules He has given to guide our feet in the way of life, then it is deadly earnest. 'Ponder the path of thy feet,' says the wise man in Proverbs. 'Walk in the way of my statutes,' says God.

If we so walk, we can walk without fear. Always and at any cost be 'on the square.'

The Christian Year.

Fourth Sunday after Easter.

The Lord's Servant shall not strive.

'He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgment unto victory.'—Mt $12^{19.20}$.

These words form part of the prophecy of Isaiah regarding the Servant of the Lord; and whatever may have been their original application, they have certainly found fit fulfilment in the life and character of Jesus Christ. They are quoted by the Evangelist Matthew, however, almost apologetically, and as an excuse for some unexpected conduct on the part of the Master. The occasion was the healing of a man on the Sabbath day.

But there is much more in these words than an occasional excuse for occasional conduct on the part of Jesus. They represent a deep-rooted principle of His life—a policy which regulated His whole earthly career. The mission of Jesus was to save rather than to destroy, to build up rather than to pull down.

1. 'He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street.' Such is the Revised Version rendering of the passage in Isaiah, and the words are very vivid and emphatic. A rough and idiomatic English translation would be something like this: 'He shall not scream, nor make a noise, nor advertise himself.' There is nothing loud, hysterical, or self-assertive about the method of Jesus. He is too wise and strong to descend to such devices, and the Spirit of God that is in Him will not suffer Him to use the means loved of men. There is nothing in Him of the demagogue or the agitator; the Kingdom of God cometh not with observation. The Pharisees, with their scrupulous piety and their hedge round the Law, were an

abomination to Him, and yet it was not until the very end of His career that He came into open opposition with them, and denounced them. He preferred to construct before He pulled down. He knew when to be silent and when to speak. He felt that it was better not to testify at all than to testify at the wrong time and in the wrong place. His real triumphs were not won in the streets or before the eyes of men, but in the wilderness, on the lonely mountain-side, in the little house at Bethany, or in the Garden of Gethsemane.

When His adversaries raged and plotted He was calm; when His judge bullied Him He was gentle and courteous; He turned His cheek to the smiter; and when they mocked His dying throes He prayed, 'Father, forgive them; they know not what they do.' From first to last He showed the same spirit; His strength was in gentleness and His greatness in humility.

But what exactly does this example mean for us? The very fact that the result of this policy for Jesus was the scourge and the Cross and the malefactor's grave shows that it is far removed from some of our pusillanimous imitations of it. As a matter of fact, the example here for us is not so much one of policy as of temper. We have to testify to the truth as it is in Jesus, and we have to oppose the spirit and the works of this world. But everything depends on how we do it. Our witness has to be to truth, not to ourselves, and our strife with evil has to be effective rather than loud.

There is no room in religious work for excitement, though there may be ample scope for earnestness and enthusiasm. Self is the first demon that needs to be exorcised, and meekness is the first necessity. If a man is forced to the front let him stand there and hold his ground in God's name, but let him never lift a finger to obtain the place for himself. In quietness and confidence is our strength. Our work may never be heard of on the lips of men; it may be carried on in poverty and disappointment and tears; it may show all the features which the world counts as those of failure; and yet for that very reason it may meet with the approval of the Master who did not strive nor cry. And on the other hand, our work may show very large in statistics; we may command the ear of a crowd and the praise of men; but if it be known as our work, and if we are exalted by it, then it will scarcely win the approval of the Christ who humbled Himself, and would not lift up His voice in the streets. This does not mean that all our modern methods are vitiated with this taint, but the danger in them is great.

2. 'A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench.' These beautiful words imply that the same gentle and patient spirit which regulated the public policy of Jesus regulates also His more personal dealings with men. Even the crushed reed of a broken and ruined life, which most men would throw away as worth nothing, He will try to straighten and set up again; and the smouldering wick of a half-formed purpose of good He will not deaden, but fan and cherish into new warmth and brightness. The metaphor is a very fine one, and admits of a wide application. It is often regarded as referring in the first instance to the attitude of Christ to the heathen world around Him, and has been explained thus: 'This is the singularly humane and compassionate view the prophecy takes of the Gentiles; they are bruised reeds and expiring flames. . . . What the prophecy may refer to is the human virtues, expiring among the nations but not yet dead; the sense of God debased by idolatries but not extinct; the consciousness in the individual soul of its own worth and its incapacities, and the glimmering ideal of a true life and a worthy activity almost crushed out. . . . This flickering light the Servant shall feed and blow into a flame.' So in all our dealings with the heathen world, and in seeking to convert men to the gospel of the Prince of Peace, we shall do well not to ignore the good in them if we would replace it by a better.

But this missionary application of the words of the prophet is by no means the only one or the best. A further thought here is that Christ looks upon men with other eyes than ours; that He sees good in them, and cherishes hope for them where we fail to do so; and that all the good He finds in them He will use for His own ends. There is something truly Divine and very consoling to our weak humanity in the invincible belief of Jesus that men are capable of being saved. In that belief He came into the world, and for it He suffered and died. The sin that you do may cut you off from men, may drive you out of respectable houses, may make you an outlaw and a vagabond in this world, but it can never cut you off from the pity of Christ.

And the same is true of those who are hard-pressed in the battle of life, of those who labour and are heavy-laden. Trouble can scotch but it cannot kill, and Christ is stronger than all the forces of this world. He will not add by the weight of a hair to the heavy burdens that men carry. His yoke is easy and His burden light. When fortune has vanished, and health is impaired, and the spirit is broken, and the world frowns—then He can do

His work, and bind up our bruises, and pour oil into our wounds, and give a new foundation to faith and kindle hope afresh. The Good Shepherd gathers the lambs in His bosom, and gently leads those that are with young. 'Come unto me,' He says, 'all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.'

And if it be but a faithless spirit from which we suffer, He shows the same tireless patience and the same restoring grace. When the flame of Divine life in us is faint and flickering, He will fan and cherish it till it grows bright and strong. 'The bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench.'[1]

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

The Laws of Prayer.

'Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.'—Mt 7^7.

If God is absolutely good and absolutely wise, if He knows all with absolute knowledge and does all with absolute power, where is there place in His government for the interference of ignorant, erring, foolish mortals? God deals with us as with children, and the law which is above every law is the law of love. But must not love itself refuse to accommodate its wise purposes to our unwise desires? If God's rule is already the wisest and the best, must not love, even for our sakes, guard it from our foolish interference? Yet, if God really deals with us as with children, might not a law of prayer itself prove to be part of this wisest and best rule?

This law our Lord here enunciates. It is no sanction of wandering desires or worship of our own wills, but just the highest example of the great law of sowing and reaping. It sets forth three methods of God and three stages of our own prayers; and by considering them, we may see, not only how God answers prayer, but how no prayer goes unanswered.

1. Prayer is spoken of as an asking in order to receive. If we ask, we receive without condition made or exception admitted. This is the first law—*the Law of Receiving.*

There are doubtless definite and direct answers to prayer; and, if we asked more simply and with greater faith, we might all be surer of God's hand in the events of our lives. But we have also the highest examples to warn us not to expect, in any uniform, immediate, or visible way, the thing we ask. Paul thrice besought the Lord in vain that the messenger of Satan to buffet him should depart. A still greater than Paul, even He who uttered this saying, cried, 'If it be possible, let this cup pass from me': and it did not pass. The Cross was the only answer to His prayer. It is the answer to many prayers. Perhaps no one rightly prays in Christ's name without realizing that it may be the answer to any prayer.

Yet we may not say that either asked and was denied. Paul's desire to profit by all experiences was greater than his desire to choose what any experience might be. The Master's wish that God's will should be done was far above any wish to be spared the agony necessary for the doing of it. When God's will was done, for His glory and the good of man, Jesus had nothing in His heart but utter submission. This distinction between the wish of the moment and the unwavering purpose of the life must ever be kept in mind.

Prayer, as the hymn says, is 'the soul's sincere desire.' Nay, 'sincere' is superfluous. All desire is sincere. Only the utterance of it can be insincere. Every longing is a prayer; and our most effectual, fervent prayer is our strongest longing. But, if that is so, for what have we prayed? For everything, base as well as noble, we ever set our hearts on. If this be the meaning of asking, is our Lord's assertion so certainly contradicted by experience? Do we not all, in a quite amazing way, receive in the line of our desires? And beyond this life is eternity, with the answers which still await our longing. Our highest aspirations alone may be its promise, but none of our desires may be wholly unanswered.

> All we have willed or hoped or dreamed of
> good shall exist.

And though the good only may be everlasting, may not the evil also have a kind of immortality? 'As the fins of a fish foreshadow that water exists, or the wings of an eagle in the egg presuppose air,' so every longing of the heart foreshadows some kind of realization. That is a universal law; and it is the laws of the spirit, and not of the body, which endure.

Strange mystery of the soul of man made in the image of God, strange power of his asking, strange intimacy with the working of the Eternal! To whatsoever we ask the answer is so sure that for it we need have no concern. Our one need is to be taught to ask truly in Christ's name, so that all our desires may be wholly according to the Father's love and the Father's wisdom.

2. But, if we receive what we ask, we do not receive it at our own time and in our own way.

[1] W. B. Selbie, *The Servant of God*, 223.

Yet it is not the whole truth when we say it is at God's time and in His way. That is not adequate, because it is not His mere pleasure which determines either His giving or His withholding. The law of receiving is suspended only by a higher law—*the Law of Finding.*

God, we too readily assume, must speak, and man simply receive. But it is not so now, and never has been. God is wiser, more patient, and, above all, more magnanimous. 'It is,' one of the Proverbs says, 'the glory of God to conceal a thing, but the honour of kings is to search out a matter.' To give this regal glory, God conceals. He would lift us up and crown us, in the glory of His own discernment, over all His works.

Nor is the supreme revelation, the Word of God Himself, an exception. Even His sayings and doings are valueless till, by seeking, we find them for ourselves anew. His truth may be the most familiar thing in life yet have no real existence for us, even as a man might plough all his days with the gold shining in the furrow, yet die in poverty. Christ's demand still is, 'Seek, and ye shall find'; and those He never fails are the seekers after God.

Only what we seek shows what in our own hearts we are, and prophesies what, in the end, we shall be. Wherefore, even more than in what we ask, it is the wings of the eagle in the egg. Even in time, the best of life is finding what we seek; and, in the day when our real spiritual world disentangles itself from the fashions and shadows of time, we shall find the rest. There need be no uncertainty about finding. The one fear is that the thing we have been seeking may prove ashes for bread, corruption for life, darkness for light.

3. This law of finding, however, is limited by a still higher law, which is *the Law of Discovering*—'Knock, and it shall be opened unto you.'

This is the law which requires the long delays to which we are all subjected and by which so many are discouraged. For many weary years we may stand faced by doors which never open to our knocking. If we have accepted no denial, if delay has only enlarged our measure of blessings beyond our present knowing and increased our urgency, then we have most truly waited upon God. Such persistent knocking at the door of life's mystery is the deepest, the best attested, the most efficacious utterance of the heart, the only form of prayer wholly adequate to God's infinite and eternal purpose with the souls of men.

To knock that it may be opened unto us is more than to receive what we know we desire, and more than to find what we know we are seeking. It is the awaiting of a discovery of truth and beauty and goodness beyond all our knowing. Yet it is not a mere expectation of lighting upon, by accident, something wholly unanticipated and strange. Like all discovery, it is at once beyond our asking or our seeking, yet the receiving of our heart's desire, the finding of what we have ever pursued. It is the unexpected, yet the realization of our expectation; the strange, yet with nothing stranger in it than its familiarity.

When Kepler, after years of study, discovered the true orbit of the planets, it was a new revelation to lift up his heart in wonder and adoration, but, while it had the marvel of the unexpected, had it the strangeness of the unanticipated? Rather would it appear merely simple and beautiful and right, the natural order of his disordered ideas, the perfection he had ever followed, so fitting as to leave him amazed at ever having thought that God's way of working was different.

All our days God is opening doors for those of us who continue knocking, but the blankest one at the end is also the widest. When it opens, it will be in the largest sense upon what it has not entered into our heart to conceive. Yet may there not be, in a still deeper sense, nothing new? Shall we not find ourselves still on the old road, with nothing altered except the opening of the gates which obstructed our vision? Life will stretch before us with a vast and hitherto unrealized meaning, but will it not also be just the old life, with its meaning the fulfilment of life's foreshadowings and its blessings the natural satisfaction of our gropings?

We shall then know that our greatest, truest, most efficacious prayers were neither our petitions for what we thought we needed, nor our reaching out after what we thought our goal, but what the Apostle calls the groanings that cannot be uttered, the ceaseless unrest for what was, in this world, ever beyond our knowing.

God keeps us waiting and dissatisfied and unblessed, not because He would not gladly satisfy our desire and reward our seeking, but because His is a larger love which would give us a still higher possession on the better title of our own discovery. In that confidence let us pray—asking, seeking, knocking—knowing the blankest door of His seeming denial to be only the barrier that will open upon His fullest manifestation. So shall we pray, not only when we worship together in the sanctuary or kneel at our private devotions, but by a whole life of trust, of dependence, of thanksgiving, and, above all, of waiting at the door of life's mystery, which is life's prophecy and hope.[1]

[1] J. Oman, *The Paradox of the World*, 280.

SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION DAY.

Enlarging Knowledge.

'Then shall we know, if we follow on to know the Lord.'—Hos 6^3.

There are certain definite stages in this enlarging knowledge of the Lord which can be clearly marked. They are set down for us in the New Testament. Let us consider them, then, in their order.

1. The first stage is *the knowledge of the risen Lord.* It is a great gift of God's grace to believe in Christ who lived and died. It is a transforming experience to know Christ who not only died but rose again. The closing pages of the Gospels show us men whose religion was but a tender memory. Its most sacred spot was a grave with a stone set upon it. Their hopes were only the wreck of vanished dreams. Suddenly there rings in the ears of this little band of dispirited men and women the cry, 'The Lord is risen!' From that time they rose up to a new plane of knowledge whose sublime significances filled them with awe and roused them to rapture. The glory of the risen Lord and the solemn certainty of His haunting presence paled the words and deeds of Galilee and Samaria.

The power of this knowledge of the risen Christ works like a spell. Literature with its prophetic instinct has divined its significance. Even Goethe, tinged though he was by pagan ideals, makes the bells of Easter Sunday morning ring in new hope to the heart of Faust awaiting his doom. Goethe realized that the Lord who rose again victorious over sin and death could bring back the most desperate wrong-doer from the gates of hell. A nobler poet than Goethe has set this truth in a still clearer light. In the poem he calls 'Christmas Eve and Easter Day' Browning declares that the risen Lord is the fundamental fact of his faith. A doubt which was almost despair had seized upon him. The evidences of the faith no longer held him, and all the offices of its worship provoked distaste. He traces his ascent from that experience of a night of storm on the moor when he saw

> the sight
> Of a sweepy garment, vast and white,
> With a hem that I could recognize,

up to that more splendid certainty when

> The whole face turned upon me full.

Browning had become conscious of the risen Lord, and his words rise to a height of self-forgetting passion that even he seldom attains.

More convincing and more illuminating, perhaps, is the witness of humbler believers—simple men and women who began by seeing only the gentle Jesus of the children's hymn, or dwelling upon the deeds of Him who went about doing good, or rising no higher than to revere the mystic of the Mount of the Beatitudes. In some hour of quiet brooding or on some day of overwhelming sorrow they realized that Christ was risen, and was near, tender, waiting for a word, watching for a look, swift to strengthen and to help. They had followed on to know the risen Lord.

2. The second stage is *the knowledge of the ascended Lord.* We enter a rarer atmosphere here, and we touch a more difficult truth. We are lifting up our eyes to the cloud which received Him out of their sight, and seeing the throne above it. Seldom does any young believer, even although assured that Christ is risen, attain with confidence to a sense of the ascended Lord. The early believers grew slowly into that certainty and still more slowly into its power. As it became the sure possession of their hearts, they were almost intoxicated by the thought that Christ is Lord of all. We see Stephen, as he dies in the field of the outcast, lifting his eyes to behold Jesus on the right hand of God. We see Paul in his prison strengthening his soul with the assurance that Christ must reign until He has put all His enemies under His feet. All the great believers have seen this sight, and all the most splendid services have been done under its inspiration. Every great preacher has a constant vision of an exalted Christ. His victorious optimism ebbs and flows as the certainty of the ascended Lord becomes dim or shines out in transforming power.

There are times when the one assurance the Church needs is to see Jesus on the right hand of God. There is so much amiss in the world, so much sorrow and pain, and the tears are not wiped away. The victory of righteousness is so costly, so broken, and so slow. Yet even in our dullest hours the vision of our Lord on the throne sends a flood of buoyant energy through our veins. There is a poem by Walt Whitman which illustrates this power of an assurance of an ascended Lord. He is recalling the famous march of Sherman through Georgia to the sea. He remembers that, when a soldier in the ranks, he passed an old, half-blind negro woman sitting by the roadside. Never did she expect to see freedom given to her race. But as the soldiers passed on in their victorious march she realized in her own poor, wondering way that a new power was ruling in the land, and that,

however long and blood-stained the struggle might yet be, the end of it was liberty to the slave.

Who are you, dusky woman, so ancient hardly human,
With your woolly-white and turban'd head, and bare bony feet?
Why rising by the roadside here, do you the colours greet?

Me master years a hundred since from my parents sunder'd,
A little child, they caught me as the savage beast is caught,
Then hither me across the sea the cruel slaver brought.

No further does she say, but lingering all the day,
Her high-borne turban'd head she wags, and rolls her darkling eye,
And courtesies to the regiments, the guidons moving by.

3. The third stage is *the knowledge of the indwelling Lord*. There is a sense in which the knowledge of the ascended Lord seems to remove Him far from us and to make Him a distant and almost absent personality. But we follow on to a knowledge which brings Him nearer than before. We no longer know Christ 'after the flesh.' As Paul says, 'The Lord is that Spirit.' Spirit can touch spirit, spirit can dwell with spirit, spirit can interpenetrate spirit, with the swiftness and instancy and power of thought and desire and passion. The writers of the Epistles, therefore, speak of Christ not only as risen, and ascended, but as formed within them, pulsing within their wills, becoming the energy of their lives, enshrined in their hearts, indwelling within the temple of their spirits.

When the longing for God and a sense of His love is a spring of desire in our hearts, when the beauty of holiness in Christ has risen upon us with the rapture of a new dawn, we know that Christ dwells within. While we worship, while we serve, while we suffer, or while we pray, we find that the Lord is within, and we enter into the knowledge of the indwelling Christ. Myers has engrossed that experience in an impassioned verse when he makes St. Paul cry:

Then thro' the mid complaint of my confession,
Then thro' the pang and passion of my prayer,
Leaps with a start the shock of his possession,
Thrills me and touches, and the Lord is there.

After a brilliant course at Yale, Horace Bushnell turned aside from a career of the highest promise to preach the gospel to a little congregation of believing men. He turned aside because he had entered into 'the secret of the Lord.' Some fifteen years later he followed on to know the Lord. He lost his only son, and in that hour of keenly felt trial his holden eyes were opened and he saw the risen Lord. In succeeding years he passed on, as all men do who are sure that Christ is risen, to the conception of the ascended Christ. But five years later, as he expresses it, he 'passed a boundary.' Christ has been pressing in upon him with a gentle and insistent sense of His nearness. He came down one February morning, after a night of quiet wakefulness, with a new light on his face. When one asked him, 'What have you seen?' this preacher of Christ for over twenty years replied, 'The gospel!' He sat down to pour the treasures of his new experience into a meditation on the words, 'Until Christ be formed in you.' He proclaimed as a revelation from the Spirit of God his new knowledge of Christ as the indwelling, energizing, and sanctifying life of the soul. A new serenity of spirit and a wondrously sweet sanctity marked his after-years.

The secret of the Lord is not consummated even when we know His indwelling. We do not yet know as we are known. Yet no higher knowledge shall be given to us here. 'Now we know in part,' writes Paul, 'but then shall we know even as we are known.'[1]

WHITSUNDAY.

The Pledge of God's Honour.

'God, who hath . . . given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.'—2 Co 1^{22}.

The thought underlying these words was a familiar one to the Apostle Paul. He uses these very words on several occasions, and where he does not use these very words, the thought which underlies them is present to his mind. Thus he speaks in a certain place of 'the testimony of our conscience,' and once again of 'the Spirit bearing witness with our spirit that we are the children of God.' You will find that there is one tone, one note in all these passages. You will find that as this thought comes over the Apostle's mind, every other feeling leaves him suddenly, and he becomes confident, hopeful, happy. The pressure of things becomes easier, things begin to look different—it is as though some Holy Presence at that moment came into a room, and by its own invincible goodness subdued all things to its own quietness and dignity.

[1] W. M. Clow, *The Secret of the Lord*, 342.

Now what is this thought which could so soothe and fortify the Apostle's soul? Is it not just this—that in all circumstances he has it in his power to fall back upon God? 'We have the earnest of the Spirit.' We have God working within ourselves. We have the living God in our hearts, God living in our hearts; and that removes the terrible fear to which we are tempted in our discouraged hours. The Apostle was sure of God, and to be sure of God is to be sure that all God's will shall yet be done. What if this happens only at length, only at the end of the days! If it happens so it must be that that and no other was the will of God. And so his spirit leaned back upon God; he felt for God's hand, and found it near, and the anxiety about himself and about the future passed clean out of his mind. He was anointed for the battle; he was prepared to wait. Now this is a way of looking at our life which we also shall have, sooner or later, to take up. We, too, must be able to fall back upon some inward and personal confidence, and there to stand as it were upon a rock. We, too, shall have to learn to trust to the earnest of the Spirit. This, indeed, is just the life of faith or the spiritual mind. Without it we are not religious at all.

'The earnest of the Spirit.' The word translated 'earnest' was a word used only in business transactions. It was a Phœnician word coined by the Phœnicians, the founders of trade in our modern sense. It meant a portion of the purchase money—the pledge on the one hand that the transaction was settled once for all, and, on the other, that the remainder of the money would be paid in course of time. If the man who gave you the earnest (*arrhabo*), the pledge, was trustworthy, then you were in as good a position as you would be if you had received the entire amount in your hand.

Let us take three matters, concerning which it is of the utmost necessity that we have, each one of us, trustworthy and abiding convictions; and these convictions take root only in lives which are within the daily illumination and control of God.

Take these three great matters, then, concerning which we must each have a private faith and confidence—*the being of God; the salvation of our soul; and our personal existence after death.* Those three matters are, indeed, not to be separated. Yet we can separate them in our thoughts, and a man is not really alive who has not arrived at some doctrine or belief concerning these great matters, by which belief he is shaping his present life and anticipating his destiny. With regard to these, how true it is that we have only the earnest of the Spirit.

Take the supreme matter, *the being of God.* What do we know of God? How are we to know what He is? How, indeed, are we to know that He is? We may ask men, as Isaiah did, 'to lift up their eyes on high and see who hath erected these things, that bringeth out their host by number.' We may bid men open their eyes to the majesty of the night-sky, to the beauty and order of the created world. We may bid a man consider what a piece of work he himself is. We may ask men, in short, to think, knowing that if they think on and on they will arrive at some notion about God, by whom all things stand fast. But the Apostle takes another way—a way, too, that is more likely to bring conviction in these very days of ours. He bids us trace the outlines of God's character in His dealings with us privately. Has God come near to us? Has He interrupted us, showing us that we do not belong to ourselves, but are here to obey Him, here to do or to bear what He decrees? Does night fall upon our spirits the moment we have done some wrong? And does not night stay with us until we bend our stiff heart before God and ask Him to pardon us and give us peace? When we pray, when we ask for strength to go on beneath some load, it may be, which we know we must bear, do we really find strength? If we had any experience of such visitations, we have the earnest of the Spirit—the Spirit bearing witness with our spirit that we are the sons of God. God has in these things given us His pledge; the rest will come.

There are times when, as we consider the world in which we live, and how it seems to give the lie to all our deepest hopes for it, the cry breaks from us, 'O Lord, how long?' But be still, my soul, it is not for thee to know the times and the seasons. Has not God given thee the earnest of the Spirit? To have faith is to be faithful to that.

What ground of confidence have we that *our soul shall be finally saved*, that it shall rise steadily through all its experiences to God? Who is there—among those who are really seeking to please God—who has not been humbled and ashamed to find that unworthy things were still alive within him, ready at a moment to master him? Our inward life is so complicated, so subtle, that it is often difficult for us to say that we have made progress, that we are more steadily and habitually Christian in our disposition. One day our feet are on a rock; we feel sure of ourselves, of our outward behaviour, and of the very temper of our mind: next day our feet are on miry clay; we struggle and lose ground, and are full of unhappiness. Where, in such a case, is our confidence that some abiding

good is surely coming in spite of many a disheartening sign? We fall back upon God, who is working within us. Whatever we have felt of His influence, we hold as an earnest, as a pledge from Him of our eventual deliverance. And so, in days when we are troubled, as indeed we should be troubled, by our personal failures, by our low aims and unsteady obedience, let us remember that our confidence is in God; in God, who was behind such improvement as we could ever claim. A man gets back his confidence when he reminds himself that his salvation does not depend upon his grasp of God, but upon God's grasp of him.

The profoundest question which can engage us is the question of *our personal immortality*—the question which Job raised when he said, 'A man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?' The truth about this great matter is hidden from us in many of its aspects. We cannot see into the world of spirits; we cannot hold fellowship except by faith with those whom we have loved and lost. Where, then, shall we rest our confidence that we shall survive the disaster of death and shall go forward into a closer life with God? There are reasons and reasons which may be given to strengthen our instinctive belief in our personal existence after death. But these are not what the Apostle means when he speaks of 'the earnest of the Spirit.'

The belief in our own immortality can never be a real conviction—it will be at best a kind of hearsay—until we base it upon the earnest of the Spirit; until we feel the soul growing within us, aspiring towards God, protesting against the dominion of the carnal mind; until we feel that we have that within us which this present world cannot satisfy, we are not using real words when we speak of immortality.

Only they who have the earnest of the Spirit are quite sure of immortality. And this they know, because even now they feel that they are living unto God. They feel that God is moulding, making, unmaking, remaking, casting down, and building up their life in its secret and immortal parts. 'If God lives, I shall live,' they say, 'and live with Him. If Christ lives, then when my soul is set free by death to choose its own place, it will hie away to Christ like a bird to its nest. He will call, and I will answer Him. He will have a desire to the work of His hands.' We know that another life awaits us, because even now we hold communications with it.[1]

[1] J. A. Hutton, *The Fear of Things*, 157.

Recent Foreign Theology.

German Theology.

From the pen of Professor Traub we expect vigorous and lucid argument, and this brief treatise[1] satisfies our anticipations. The subject is old but ever new. Opening with some most relevant pages on the paradox or perversity of Barth's theological estimate of history as the medium of revelation, Traub proceeds to a scrutiny of the positions of Troeltsch and Schweitzer. The obscurities of both are faithfully dealt with. The conclusion reached is that rationalistic, speculative, mystical theologies, as well as that affiliated to the Comparative Science of Religions, can view historical criticism of the Gospels with comparative equanimity; for none of them needs the historical Christ as the foundation of faith, so that to them it matters nothing whether He be proved quite unhistorical, or, at the other extreme, be made the mere prisoner of His age. On this there follows a sympathetic review of the Ritschlian leaders and, in addition, Kähler and Heim, which lays stress on their common conviction that historical research cannot form the basis of faith, first because it yields nothing more than probabilities (however high), and secondly because the saints would thereby be brought into an intolerable dependence on the scholars. This result Traub confirms by a short but telling criticism of the *formgeschichtliche* method, as practised by Bultmann.

Traub next sets forth in positive fashion his own belief that the Christ of history is the foundation-stone of faith. We can know Him directly as one with God, as filled with moral majesty, as the Lover of the sinful. The impression made on earnest minds by that picture of the Saviour which lives and works on in the Church is such as to authenticate itself. Seen as He is, He becomes a present reality to conscience and heart. This signifies that while our certainty of the historical revelation is not gained through research, it is not unrelated to it. If the non-existence of Jesus

[1] *Glaube und Geschichte*, by Friedrich Traub (L. Klotz Verlag, Gotha, 1926. Pp. 61. M.2.50).

could be proved by the historians, it would be all over with faith. But such proof can never be furnished, for the irresistible impression of His reality renders any attempt of the kind wholly unconvincing. Attention might have been called to the circularity of this argument, which is not a weakness but a strength.

Traub closes his stimulating pamphlet by reminding us, as Herrmann used to do, that historical science may do good by knocking away false supports of faith, as well as by animating and enriching the faith which it will not, if it is wise, attempt to demonstrate.

From the firm of Leopold Klotz comes also an attractive anthology of modern German poems about Jesus.[1] To lovers of lyric poetry this book will be welcome alike for reasons of faith and of art. In addition to well-known Catholic and Protestant verse, the work of naturalistic writers has been included; the late Leopold von Pohlenz, whose sympathies leant to naturalism, is represented by a striking piece which protests against the weak and amiable pictures of Christ which we have too often had to endure. In all, fifty-one authors have been chosen, from Hölderlin to our own day. Of making anthologies there is no end, but for this one at least justification can be pleaded. The book is full of a reverent love for Christ.

Wittig's 'Life of Jesus'[2] differs widely from all others. Certainly in its external fortunes it stands by itself. Shortly after its publication by a Catholic firm it was placed on the Index; and in the summer of last year the author was excommunicated. He taught formerly as a Professor of Church History; here he writes as a poet in prose. To a large extent the book is autobiographical; Wittig's boyhood, student years, and subsequent career are narrated—more or less freely and imaginatively, one supposes. But with all this warp there is intertwined as woof the life of Jesus, on the mystic principle that Jesus and the Christian pass through the same experiences. The second volume, however, keeps somewhat closer to the Gospel narrative. Wittig writes with simplicity and beauty. Many passages in the Synoptics have a new light flung upon them. Throughout we are in contact with a fresh and joyous piety, to which Christ is everything; at times we are brought up short by infelicitous efforts to be wise above what is written.

This[3] is a careful study of Calvin's relation to St. Augustine in the field of sacramental teaching. Calvin had an independent position among Reformation thinkers, but he seems to have attached high importance to being on the same side as Augustine in this domain, and quotes him with great freedom. He appeals to him, for example, regarding the distinction, yet close relation, of *res* and *signum*, the inefficacy of mere outward reception, the possibility that God may bless altogether apart from sacraments, and the merely relative necessity alike of Baptism and the Eucharist. They agree in thinking on the subject more deductively than inductively; in holding that grace is *offered* in the sacraments—this is what they mean by objectivity—but only becomes ours through faith; in urging that the sacrament is God's instrument but not His representative; in denying that the unbelieving receive orally a Divine gift, even though only to their hurt. For both, the sacraments are parallel to the Word and bestow no blessing new in kind; what they do, rather, is to make the realities possessed by faith more vivid and apprehensible. Christ's presence is brought home to faith by the action of the Holy Spirit; in fact, the Spirit may in a sense be called the true *res sacramenti*. But neither, obviously enough, held a symbolic or psychological view; Christ is present in the Eucharist, for example, as Himself all the grace we need.

These principles of their sacramental thinking are elucidated by Beckmann in a long, scholarly chapter; thereafter they are exemplified in a discussion of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Beckmann has difficulties over Baptism, for Augustine and Calvin were here fronting different antagonists. Also it is a realm in which Calvin shows himself much the more accomplished theologian. But in a fine chapter on the Eucharist Beckmann has no difficulty in exhibiting a fundamental harmony between the older thinker and the later. Thus he points out that both assert clearly—(1) the strict localization of the flesh of Christ in heaven; (2) the absence of any direct relation of the symbols to the flesh and blood of Christ; (3) the actualization of the presence of Christ through the Spirit to faith. For Augustine as for Calvin the presence of Christ in the Supper is a special case of His continual presence with believers.

[1] Röttger, *Moderne Jesusdichtung* (M.6).

[2] *Leben Jesu in Palästina, Schlesien und anderswo*, by Joseph Wittig. 2 vols. (L. Klotz Verlag, Gotha. M.12).

[3] *Vom Sakrament bei Calvin*, by Joachim Beckmann (Mohr, Tübingen, 1926. Pp. viii, 165. M.5.40).

Augustine's opposition to a realistic view of the Eucharist is very strong. But he, like Calvin after him, put the centre where it ought to be: what we have in the Lord's Supper is *communio cum Christo*. And both drew the bond closely between our sacramental relation to Christ and to the Church, which is His Body. Calvin, as Beckmann concludes, was in vital touch throughout with St. Augustine's mind, as the Mediæval Church was not, nor the followers either of Luther or Zwingli.

On the whole, Beckmann's work is accurate and luminous, and the growing body of students busy with the investigation of Calvin's theology will hail its publication gratefully. And that he has in general made out his case will, I think, hardly be questioned. But he vainly attempts to deny that Calvin affirms the reception of the substantially present flesh of Christ. This is not in accordance with all the evidence. In his Tract on the Supper, for instance, Calvin writes: 'On receiving the sacrament in faith we are truly made partakers of the proper substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ.' 'Christ descends to us,' he says in the *Institutes*, 'that He may truly quicken our souls by the substance of His flesh and blood.' This was a modification, not for the better, of his attitude in the first edition of the *Institutes*, where it stated explicitly that the very substance of Christ's body is *not* given. The truth seems to be that in the higher reaches of his theory Calvin put forward certain speculations which have little real meaning, and which he himself must have been at a loss to understand. Failure to bring this out is the chief weakness of Beckmann's book. Another defect is the extraordinary number of errors in the printing of the Latin citations. Of these there are many more than have been mentioned in the list of *corrigenda*.

H. R. Mackintosh.

Edinburgh.

Professor Rahlfs has planned an edition of the Septuagint in sixteen parts, of which the first part, dealing with the text of Genesis, has just appeared.[1] Every student of the LXX will welcome this volume by this distinguished scholar. After an introduction in which he reminds us of the long history of the LXX—the oldest MSS. of it being separated from the original text by half a millennium—and offers a brief but happy characterization of the constituent parts of Origen's Hexapla and the Lucianic recension, he deals in detail with the MSS., giving a highly interesting account of a long fragment of Genesis (known as 911) which was purchased by Karl Schmidt at Achmin in Upper Egypt in 1906, and a photograph of which was placed at Rahlfs' disposal by Professor Sanders of Michigan. One feature of this MS. is the use of a horizontal stroke to indicate certain omitted letters—very frequently ν (*e.g.* πᾶτα for παντᾶ), but also ς (*e.g.* τῆ), υ (*e.g.* μῦ), and even α (*e.g.* ποιμνῖ), ι (*e.g.* κᾶ, ἐκᾶ), and ω (*e.g.* χρῶν). Another feature is the confusion of the vowels (*e.g.* πρόσοπων for πρόσωπον). Rahlfs' method in printing his own text has been not to follow any particular MS. but to adopt the reading which in view of all the MS. evidence and of the Hebrew original seemed the most probable. He even—perhaps wisely—has unhesitatingly incorporated in his text emendations which in his judgment were certain: for example, in 15^{15}, against the evidence of all the Greek MSS., he reads ταφείς (for תקבר) instead of τραφείς. He also has interesting remarks to make on the accentuation of proper names. Altogether he seems justified in claiming that the text as thus restored is substantially better than that of any previous edition.

[1] *Septuaginta: Genesis* (Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart; Mk.3.50).

Die Geschichte der ersten Christenheit,[2] by Professor A. Schlatter, recalls, though on a more elaborate scale, Professor E. F. Scott's recently published book on 'The First Age of Christianity.' It is an attempt to recover the living movements that lie behind the earliest Christian literature and to show how central is the disciples' experience of Christ for any adequate explanation of the origin and development of the Early Church. The problems presented by the various churches, for example, of Galatia and Corinth, and by the conflict with Judaism and Gnosticism are vividly sketched. There are interesting chapters on the development of the early Christian service, on the new gospel, etc. The book is all alive. Resting as it does upon the solid basis of mature scholarship, it also pursues incidentally a practical end, as it is the author's desire to recall the modern Church to the ancient ideas and ideals which are so powerfully present in the Early Church, and which, he believes, should be normative for the Church of every age.

Any adequate study of the history of religion must obviously include the religions of the primitive as well as of the cultured peoples. In the absence

[2] C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; Mk.12, geb. Mk.14.

of a literature it is in some ways more difficult to get at the former than the latter; but on the other hand, in the case of living races, there is the compensation that, with certain reservations, their religious ideas may be ascertained from the lips of the natives themselves. In a small but valuable book of fifty-eight pages,[1] full of quaint customs, native songs and prayers, and accounts often in the words of the native narrators themselves, Dr. Preuss introduces his readers to the ideas cherished by certain tribes of the American continent on such subjects as the dead, the gods, demons, magic, etc., which yield a fascinating glimpse into the primitive mind.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

The *magnum opus* of Schweitzer appears in a fourth edition, evidence of its continued popularity —*Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (Mohr, Tübingen; M.21). No change, nor any addition, has been made upon the edition of 1913, which carried the history down to 1912. We all know, of course, that the distinguished author has since then been otherwise and far elsewhere busily engaged. But some friend or disciple might have been found capable of at least summarizing more recent work and criticism.

Of *Islamica*, a supplement to Asia Major, 'a Journal devoted to the Languages, Art and Civilisation of Mohammedan Peoples' (Verlag der Asia Major, Kurprinzstr. 14, Leipzig), we have received vol. i. fasc. 4, edited by A. Fischer, and vol. ii. fasc. 1, edited by E. Braünlich. The contents are very varied and of very unequal interest, although the standard of scholarship is uniformly high. In the second number before us we find the last article written by the English scholar, Edward G. Browne, before his death. It is entitled 'A Parallel to the Story of the Jewish King who persecuted the Christians.' In the same number is a most interesting study of 'Fables and Animal Stories in the Older Arabic Literature.'

W. D. NIVEN.

Aberdeen.

The Phenomenological Movement.

THIS volume[2] of one hundred and forty-eight pages is described as 'Étude sur la Théorie de la Connaissance religieuse,' and the author gives a brief account of it himself in the *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuse*, 1926. Of this account the first sentence may be quoted: 'Our work, presented as a thesis for Licence in Theology at the Faculty of Protestant Theology at Strasburg, proposes to study the influence of the phenomenological movement, still little known in France, on religious philosophy. This is the reason why it is divided into three parts: (1) The crisis of religious philosophy; (2) The phenomenological movement; (3) The contributions of the phenomenological movement to the reconstruction of religious philosophy' (p. 73). As the movement referred to is as yet as little known in Great Britain as in France, the author is leading most readers into 'fresh fields and pastures new.' I have read his well-arranged, well-reasoned, well-documented, and well-expressed book with much interest and appreciation, and can most cordially recommend it as worth reading and studying. A brief summary of the contents, however, must suffice. He shows in the first part how religious philosophy, a philosophy which uses religious ideas, has passed into philosophy of religion, a philosophy of which religion itself is the object. The application of empirical psychology to religion has reduced the philosophy to the psychology of religion. As this psychology does not limit itself to describing but seeks to explain religion, it becomes a *psychologism*; that is, religion is conceived as a subjective phenomenon, and loses its objectivity, its reference to any transcendent object. Attempts to escape from this inevitable situation have been made by historicism, sociologism, pragmatism, and criticism (terms which explain themselves), but all in vain. The author believes that the phenomenology of which Husserl is the chief exponent, can offer a way out. In the second part of his book he accordingly discusses this movement. It is not so much either a system or a school as a method. What unites the representatives of this movement is 'the common conviction, that only by a return on the original sources of perception and on the discernments of reality therefrom derived can the great traditions of philosophy as conceptions and problems be appreciated, that only in this way can the conceptions be intuitively clarified, the problems be newly grounded on a basis of intuition, and then be resolved in principle' (quoted p. 36). To the idealist, realist, and critical solution of the problem of Knowledge Husserl opposes the *intentionalist*. 'In this view every elementary act of knowledge transcends itself in viewing a trans-

[1] *Die Eingeborenen Amerikas*, von Konrad Theodor Preuss (Mohr, Tübingen; Mk.2.90).

[2] *Phénoménologie et Philosophie Religieuse*, par Jean Hering (Paris: Libraire Felix Alcan, 1926).

subjective datum.' No object exists, or does not exist only within the mind, but either in the sensible or the ideal order. 'The laws called *a priori* do not express then any subjective categorical form; they express essential properties of the real.' The data of knowledge have an essence distinct from their existence; and by an act of intuition or perception that essence can be apprehended. 'Phenomenology, in the wide use of the term, is the intuitive study of all essences which are accessible to us. In a narrower sense, it is the essential study of consciousness, which makes clear its intentionalist character' (*Revue*, pp. 75–76). The author recognizes some dangers in this movement, and compares it with Bergsonism; his judgment is on the whole favourable.

In the third part, accordingly, he seeks to estimate its influence on religious philosophy, and here he makes special use of the works of Max Scheler. He notes that the 'phenomenonologists refuse absolutely to rest their religious philosophy on psychology. They on the contrary replace the religious psychology, which shuts up a man in his subjectivity by the religious phenomenology, which replaces him in his original relations with the objects of his faith.' This phenomenology is not content to rest in appearances, it seeks to discover the *a priori* of religion, theology, and philosophy. By experience it shows us the way to reality, and the distinctive character of the experience does not discredit epistemologically the object of that experience (*Revue*, pp. 77–79). It is evident that this volume raises a fundamental problem for theology, and offers a worthy effort at its satisfactory solution. ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

The Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican.

BY THE REVEREND R. S. FRANKS, M.A., D.LITT., THE WESTERN COLLEGE, BRISTOL.

IN its present position the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican (Lk 18[9-14]) is grouped with the preceding one of the importunate widow: the two then appear as dealing with the common subject of prayer. It is doubtful, however, whether such was the original association of the Parable. Its subject is not, strictly speaking, prayer, but is rather the contrast, by example of pride and humility, with the lesson that not the proud and self-satisfied but the humble and penitent are acceptable with God. The Parable most resembling it in method and character is that of the Good Samaritan, in which it is similarly shown by means of a forcible example how much better in God's sight is a merciful Samaritan than a selfish priest or Levite.

The Parable comes from Luke's special tradition. The introduction (v.[9]) is probably the work of the Evangelist. It is, like the introduction to the previous Parable, derived simply from a reflection upon the narrative itself. It is said that the Parable was spoken to some who trusted in themselves that they were righteous and thought nothing of others. The Evangelist clearly has in view the Pharisees as a class. But it is not necessary to suppose that the Parable was orginally addressed to the Pharisees, or even to a group including a number of Pharisees. Its reference is wider: it shows the right and fitting demeanour and behaviour for all men in the presence of God. The Pharisee, like the publican, belongs to the Parable. Not only Pharisees or publicans, but all men may learn the way of acceptance with God by considering this Pharisee and this publican.

Some think that the Parable bears evidence of having been spoken in Jerusalem, because, like that of the Good Samaritan, it has a Jerusalem setting. This is, however, not strictly necessary. Jesus might quite well have spoken such parables in Galilee. Luke, at any rate, has not placed either of them in Jerusalem.

We may distinguish in the Parable two parts—the story itself (vv.[10-13]), and the application (v.[14]). Even apart from the latter, the narrative works by its own force: the plastic figures of the Pharisee and the publican, the one self-righteous and confident, the other humble and penitent, seize upon the imagination and powerfully convey their own lesson.

Two men went up one day to the Temple to worship God. It is said that they 'went up,' because the Temple stood on an eminence above the rest of the city. It was in all probability at one of the regular hours of prayer that the two worshippers

sought the Temple, where God had set His name, and where prayer was naturally supposed to be specially efficacious. The one man, as we know, was a Pharisee, the other a publican: the essence of the Parable is in the content of their prayer. The identity of their purpose, of the place, and their time do but show up the absolute diversity of their mode of worship.

The Pharisee stood erect in the Temple court, as indeed was the custom (Mk 11^{25}, Mt 6^{5}), and prayed a self-confident arrogant prayer which, in form a thanksgiving, was in reality a self-congratulation. He prayed, according to the text best evidenced, 'in himself' (*πρὸς ἑαυτόν*), which would mean that the prayer was not uttered aloud, and was not intended to be heard. Such behaviour was, however, contrary to custom, and is, moreover, not in harmony with the general tendency of the narrative. It is better, therefore, to follow the alternative text of Codex Bezæ and read *καθ' ἑαυτον σταθείς*: the Pharisee stood alone by himself apart from the unclean multitude and prayed aloud. His prayer, says Loisy, is nothing but a proud monologue in which he gives himself a certificate of perfection, and crushes with his scorn those who do not understand religion after his manner, above all the publican who is present with him in the sacred enclosure. The Pharisee does not mean by other men every one but himself. He divides mankind into two classes. Pharisees and others; and he congratulates himself that he and his fellow-Pharisees are clear of the common faults of men. They are not robbers, fraudulent, adulterers, or even as this publican: how happily and conveniently does the publican present himself in the Temple court to be just the foil requisite to set off the shining splendour of Pharisaic virtue. The publican is a law-breaker, but the Pharisee actually does more than the Law demands. Works of supererogation constitute his special claim to acceptance.

We need not suppose that the Pharisee was insincere when he gave thanks to God. He does but exhibit 'the glad pride which in the true Jew necessarily expresses itself as thanksgiving' (Jülicher). An interesting illustrative Talmudic passage is quoted after Wunsche in the *Handbuch zum neuen Testament, ad loc.*: 'When the man goes forth from the house of instruction let him say the following prayer: I thank thee, Eternal, my God, that thou hast given me fellowship with those who sit in the houses of instruction, not in the corners [perhaps we should understand, of the markets as dealers—the text, however, may be corrupt]. I rise up early, and they rise up early. I rise up to the things of the law, and they rise up to vain things.' Such 'boasting' is characteristic of Judaism after the Exile. It is very apparent, for example, in Neh 13^{14}, where Nehemiah, after giving a list of the various reforms which he had made in Jerusalem, prays: 'Remember me, O my God, concerning this, and wipe not out my good deeds that I have done for the house of my God, and for the observances thereof.' So again in v.[22], after recounting further reforms, he says: 'Remember unto me, O my God, this also, and spare me according to the greatness of thy mercy.' And in vv.[28-31] we have almost a complete anticipation of the attitude of the Pharisee, both in his self-congratulation as a law-keeper and in his contempt of the law-breaker. 'And one of the sons of Joiada, the son of Eliashib the high priest, was son-in-law to Sanballat the Horonite: therefore I chased him from me. Remember them, O my God, because they have defiled the priesthood, and the covenant of the priesthood, and of the Levites. Thus cleansed I them from all strangers, and appointed wards of the priests and the Levites, every one in his work; and for the wood offering, at times appointed, and for the first-fruits—Remember me, O my God, for good.' We may trace the same strain of self-congratulation and scorn of others in the 'Psalms of Innocence' (Ps 5, 17, and 26); compare Ps 17^{5}, 'My steps have held fast to thy paths, my feet have not slipped.' And note especially Ps 26 *passim*, 'I have walked in mine integrity: I have trusted also in the Lord without wavering. . . . I have walked in thy truth. I have not sat with vain persons; neither will I go in with dissemblers. I hate the congregation of evil-doers, and will not sit with the wicked. I will wash mine hands in innocency: so will I compass thine altar, O Lord; that I may make the voice of thanksgiving to be heard. . . . Gather not my soul with sinners. . . . as for me, I will walk in mine integrity: Redeem me, and be merciful unto me.'

The Pharisee in the Parable is the extreme development of all this Jewish self-righteousness. He is naïvely happy and proud of his more than fulfilment of the Law. He fasts twice in the week: this, as we know from the Talmud, would be on Monday and on Thursday. [The *Didaché* 8^{1} shows that the practice continued in the early Christian Church.] He gives tithes, not only of the chief fruits of the earth, but of all his revenues. And in doing those things he feels, like Nehemiah, that he has reason to be satisfied with himself and

confident in his approach to God. Is he not doing even more than God demands and requires? The sincerity of the Pharisee's prayer is then not in question. What is wrong is in the feelings he expresses. The insufficiency of his religion is manifested by the importance which he attaches to the external works which he enumerates. In such things he sees the highest manifestation of piety. He feels no need except to express at once his personal satisfaction and his thankfulness to God for the state in which he finds himself. All is for the best, says Loisy, if God is as content with the Pharisee as the Pharisee is content with himself.

The contrast to these feelings of happy self-confidence is shown in the publican. He stands afar off from the Temple and from the crowd of worshippers. His attitude is that of shame and repentance for sin. He does not dare to lift his eyes to heaven. He beats his breast and implores forgiveness of God. We should, no doubt, understand that he, unlike the Pharisee, prays inwardly: he does not cry aloud, but makes his confession to God alone. He gives no thanks for righteousness attained, but acknowledges himself as a sinner. What he asks for is not temporal mercies, but the forgiveness of his sins.

Even if there were no conclusion to the Parable, the contrast of the two men in action and in spirit would be enough. We could not fail to compare the self-righteous Pharisee disadvantageously with the penitent publican. He thought the publican's iniquities served as a foil for his merits: instead, his arrogance shows up the humility of the publican. Humility appears as the only attitude of man before God.

All this is clear from the Parable itself. The Parables of Jesus are self-explaining. The truth embodied in the tale speaks for itself. Nevertheless the Parable has a conclusion and a moral. Jesus solemnly declares that of the two men the publican departs justified rather than the Pharisee. The word 'justified' implies the idea of a judicial sentence. It is as though the two attitudes here represented were put before God for His decision as to which is right. It is as in a case where two parties are involved and where the judge decides in favour of one and against the other. Thus the words 'rather than the other' are here exclusive. God rejects the Pharisee, but He receives the publican into His grace. As Johannes Weiss says, the point is not what the Pharisee and the publican thought, as they went home; but what God decided. The Parable casts light upon the saying, 'There shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety-and-nine just persons which need no repentance.'

In the text of Luke there is added the sentence, 'For whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased; but he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.' Loisy attributes this final reflection to a redactor: Luke has already reproduced it elsewhere in 14^{11}. On closer examination, it does not seem quite appropriate, though undoubtedly it is akin in general tone with the Parable. But the Pharisee in the story is not humbled, and the publican is not exalted; nor is there any reference to the final judgment, as the addition might perhaps seem to suggest. The point of the Parable is to show that humility is more pleasing to God than trust in one's own merits.

Our study of the Parable leaves us with certain questions to be answered. Every one can see how repulsive are the arrogance and the self-esteem of the Pharisee, and how atrocious are his scorn and contempt of the outcast publican. All, too, can perceive that in coming to God we should not stand upon our merits but should simply seek His grace, especially when we reflect that, judged by the standard of His holiness, we come terribly and awfully short. Not only the New Testament but the Old Testament also teaches this lesson. The note of Nehemiah and of the Psalms of Innocence is by no means characteristic of the Old Testament as a whole. Does not Isaiah, seeing the Lord throned in glory in His temple, worshipped by the seraphim which, pure as they are, veil their faces in His presence, cry from the heart: 'Woe is me! for I am undone!' Nor is he at peace till he hears the words, 'Thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin purged.' Do not the Penitential Psalms, such as, above all, Ps 32, loved of the Apostle Paul, and Ps 51, the penitential psalm *par excellence*, cry to God simply for the forgiveness of sins in utter humility and self-abasement? Does not Ps 130, perhaps the most beautiful of all the Songs of Ascents, express in the simplest and most poignant words the whole philosophy of man's true relation to God? 'If thou, Lord, shouldst mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand? But there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared.' Paul with his doctrine of justification by faith and Luther after him are but bringing to victory over all other tendencies in the Old Testament, and in the religion of the Christian Church itself the doctrine of these great Old Testament passages, in which the heart of Israel humbles itself absolutely before God, and seeks from His grace the forgiveness of its sins.

But when we read the Old Testament in a natural way, taking each passage as it comes, and doing justice to its own context, not comparing it unfavourably with others that we make our standard of interpretation, do we not, after all, recognize in Nehemiah, boasting of his merits before God, a very real and definite superiority and advantage over the semi-heathen adversaries with whom he struggled so bitterly for the establishment of Judaism after the Exile; and do we not, as we read the Psalms of Innocence, find it quite possible to put a good meaning upon them, and sympathize with the naïve and simple certainty which they express, that honour and probity must be acceptable to God, and dishonour, dishonesty, fraud, and violence must be hateful to Him? Are we to have no sympathy with the post-exilic Jew in his hard endeavour to live a life according to the Law in the midst of endless temptations to abandon the apparently impossible endeavour? It is interesting to note the fact that C. H. Spurgeon—that most doughty champion of free grace—took Nehemiah for his inspiration when he came to publish 'A record of combat with sin and of labour for the Lord,' and called it *The Sword and the Trowel*. What, then, of the Pharisees themselves? Can we show so much sympathy with their Old Testament prototypes and anticipations, and yet wholly condemn this later development? It is well known that modern Jewish scholars deny that Christianity has ever been fair to the Pharisees. They were, after all, the men who had stood against the Hellenizing movement under Antiochus Epiphanes, and had kept Judaism alive and pure. If they were 'hard-shell' Jews, it needed 'hard-shell' men for so strenuous a task: milder men would have been broken. Their very name, moreover, may give us pause. They are the 'Perushim,' or the 'separated': those who distinguished themselves from the general mass of the people by their extra piety and zeal for the Law. They are, in a word, the 'Puritans' of Israel: how can we praise our own Puritans in England and discredit the Pharisees?

The answer to all these questions lies in the acceptance of the notion of development. The good is not only often the enemy of the better, but, if it does not advance to the better, is also terribly liable to deterioration. The simple virtues praised in the Psalms of Innocence are real virtues, and in themselves most valuable. And yet there is something both deeper and higher than they are. That is the spirit of humility which alone can prevent even real virtues from losing their savour, and becoming only a cloak for secret vices, all the more deadly and subtle because they are vices of the spirit rather than of the flesh. Mozley, in his famous sermon on the Pharisees, has pointed out the contrast between the social criticism of the Old Testament prophets and that of Jesus. They lashed open sin: 'gross vices, shameless sensuality, robbery, avarice, open rapacity, crying tyranny and oppression, insolent injustice and violation of common rights, the flagrant abuses and corruptions of society.' Their work was to a great extent effectual. Israel, or the best of Israel after the Exile, accepted the yoke of the Law and abandoned open vice, as the Psalms of Innocence make manifest. But then evil, driven out of its old strongholds, found a new and subtler way by which still to retain its hold on the man. It converted the very virtue, painfully acquired by due keeping of the Law and by doing even more than the Law required, into an occasion of spiritual pride, arrogant contempt and neglect of others, and self-seeking under the guise of religion. Therefore Jesus had to condemn this new type of sinfulness, just as the prophets of Israel had before condemned the old flagrant forms of sin. He did it, in the first place, by the mere revelation of a higher righteousness than the external righteousness of law-keeping, a righteousness of motive, a righteousness based on the principle of love. The Sermon on the Mount is the great positive promulgation of this new righteousness, a righteousness exceeding that of the scribes and Pharisees as the heaven is higher than the earth. But a direct condemnation of the secret sin that lurked in Pharisaism was also necessary. The valuelessness in the sight of God of all righteousness that was merely external had to be shown up, and it had to be made clear that he was nearest to God who recognized all too clearly his own defect, and viewed himself as, even when he had done all, an unprofitable servant. The disinterested love which resembles God's can only grow in man from the soil of humility. Therefore humility was the beginning of the new ethic of the gospel. 'Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.' And therefore, too, a humble publican was nearer to God than a proud Pharisee. Pride is the secret ruin of every virtue, and makes unselfish love impossible. So it was that the Pharisee in the Parable, for all his outward show of virtue, real enough in its way, was condemned; while the publican went down to his house justified.

Contributions and Comments.

Conjectures on Some Minor Prophets.

THESE suggestions (all made between 1916 and 1917 when reading Hebrew with a friend) presuppose the reader's having Kittel's text and the Inter. Crit. Commentaries at hand. I do not include here new interpretations of the Masoretic Text nor the defence of old ones as against the I.C.C., because, though I have several of both, I wish the following to be a contribution solely to textual criticism.

Am 1^{13}, הרות] Harper seems to agree with Jewish commentators in desiderating an emendation, and gives (without complete assent) נְצֵרוֹת. I don't think any is needed: 2 K 8^{12} gives prophecy that Hazael would rip up women. If any change be desiderated, I propose חֲמוֹת, 'walls,' as nearer Masoretic Text, or חוֹמֹת (הוֹמוֹת), 'walls,' if it be objected that the form חמות does not occur. And חומת might be supported by its having been used in the form חוֹמַת, and in a similar connexion in v.[7] (cf. v.[10]) of this chapter, one so peculiarly characteristic of Amos (cf. Harper, pp. 13 and cxxxviii, 2), and for חמת see *B.D.B.*, *s.v.* חמת, p. 333[a]. Translate: 'gashed (broke through) the walls.'

2^{13}, העגלה] a well-known crux, not yet, I think, solved. Perhaps I can untie a few knots.

First, omit לה, with Gun., as dittograph. Read מלאת, 'the fulness of' [pointing apparently dubious: GK 95*h* seem to prefer the קְטֻלַּת form for this type of noun]. Article which preceded Mas. מלאה is omitted as dittograph from final ה of העגלה. There seems no reason why מ should not be a noun as far as consonants (and Mas. pointing) go. Translate: 'the fulness of the swaths makes the thrashing-waggon groan.'

Otherwise, still reading מלאת, transpose לה to follow עמיר, 'the swaths,' and translate: 'the fulness of the swaths in it makes to groan (or, oppresses) the thrashing-waggon' = מלאת עמיר לה.

As an alternative I suggest תָּעוּק, 'is oppressed,' 'groans under' (or תּוּעַק, 'is made groan,' 'made be pressed down'). Former is nearer Mas. consonants, and besides, the Niph. as mere pass. of Qal, is apparently as early as Ho at any rate. Rest of consonants now remain intact, but the לה now forms part of next word, עמיר, *i.e.* 'by the swaths,' as a prep. denoting agency—cf. *B.D.B.* p. 514*d*. Anyhow, there seems no need to change עוק into פוק, 'totter,' 'reel,' for could not עוק = 'groan,' as in 'the table groans (*i.e.* shows signs of being oppressed) with delicacies'—but I would not press this too far (yet cf. מועקה, 'compression,' *i.e.* 'distress'). The zaqeph of course, with this reading, shifts to המלאה, and sentence now runs: תעוק העגלה המלאה לָעמיר, 'the full thrashing-waggon is oppressed on account of (by) the swaths.' [Further, for connexion of ideas between 'groan' and 'be oppressed,' cf. the Gaelic *cnead*, which really = 'a groan,' 'sigh,' 'moan,' but is used in a very old place-name stanza of the sigh or snort of a cow oppressed (though happy) through fullness of food. About certain spots near Little Loch Broom the Cailleach Bhior said:

> Lochaidh Bhraoin is Lochaidh Nead
> Achlais a' Mhaoir agus An Nead
> far am bi a' bhleoghannach mhór
> agus a dheanadh a' bhó a cnead.

i.e. 'L.B. and L.N., A. a'Mh. and An N. where the milking is big and the <full> cow gives a grunt (sigh of repleted satisfaction).' This topical meaning of *cnead* is known in other districts, *e.g.* Coll and Jura, though not in any single dictionary.]

5^{9}, המבלג] The various conjectures seem too far off Mas. *ductus litterarum*. Yet something is needed. Would המדלג, 'he who causes to leap,' be possible? [I take this opportunity of suggesting that the LXX and ᵑ both represent המפלג, 'he who causes to be divided' [I now see Nowack has anticipated me herein]; and that the Vulg. *qui arridet* translates המלעג, 'he who mocks.' A book giving the probable Hebrew originals of all the Greek and Latin variants from the Masoretic Text is a great desideratum. Urged when an undergraduate to compile this, occasionally I have amused myself at it, but the task needs much time and much leisure, and the vast learning I can never hope to possess. Yet if we had this (and a syndicate of scholars could easily complete it), we should be on a fair way towards emending with some degree of certainty the Masoretic Text.]

6^{12}, בבקרים] Working on Hal.'s emendation I pro-

pose בְּבָקָר, 'with cattle,' or בְּבָקָר רֵמִים, 'a yore ox teamed with cattle,' which is better still, and seems preferable to Harper's selection. Or, using a word Amos employs in speaking about himself, הַבּוֹקֵר בָּרִים, 'the herdsman . . . with a yore ox.' [The plural רמים would do. To conjecture בַּבֹּקֶר ('in the morning') does not help the sense overmuch, though I am surprised no one seems to have thought of it.]

I fear my third attempt may seem too far-fetched: יַחֲרֹשׁ בַּבָּקָר רִים, 'will a yore ox plough in the morning?'

Na 1[4], אמלל] 'Acrostic calls for an initial ד'—so Powis Smith rightly. Read (?)דלח, 'he disturbs,' 'makes turbid'; cf. רגליו and *B.D.B.*

2[6], יזכר] After Du. I conjecture דהרו אדירים, referring to attackers: 'the officers dash to and fro' to direct the assault and stumble in their eagerness.' Used later by Na (3[2]), and in noun of riders (Jg 5[22]). Compare too Powis Smith, p. 317, 'if the text be correct it is probable that the stumbling must be accounted for by the haste and eagerness of the advancing host.'

2[8] . . .] והצ After Gry, Rub. and Hpt., I conjecture וּבְצַב הֻנְלְתָה הֶעָתְלָה, 'and in a palanquin 'Athālah is carried out of the land,' and refer the words to the deportation of the high and mighty (cf. Assyr. fem. adj. *etellitu* = 'great') goddess (or even queen), carried on a litter-waggon and borne ceremoniously. Targ. paraphrases these first three words as: 'and the queen who sat furthering the captivities went forth.'

[Did LXX in v.[10] read חיבל?]

Ob 13[a], אידם] Now. and Marti read אֵידוֹ, 'his calamity,' 'distress'; accept this and perhaps add אֹיְבֶיךָ, 'thy enemies'? R. Burn.

Glasgow.

Cross-Bearing.

I thank Mr. Matheson for his remarks in your January number on my article on 'Taking up the Cross,' which appeared in your issue for September 1926.

I confess, however, that I am quite unable to follow Mr. Matheson's reasoning when he says that my 'theory breaks down over Simon of Cyrene, where Luke uses *φέρειν* to translate Mark's *αἴρειν*.' Surely, he does not hold that because, superficially, there is an approximation in the meaning of the two words as used in our records of the transport of the Cross from the court to Calvary, therefore *αἴρειν* must be taken as synonymous with *φέρειν* in a phrase employed by Christ many months before, in contexts which have no resemblance to the story of the *Via Dolorosa*, and in circumstances which have no relation with the incidents at Jerusalem. Does Luke himself use *αἴρειν* in that sense in v.[18] of this same chapter (*αἶρε τοῦτον*—'away with him,' A.V.)?

Further, is Luke really translating Mark in this instance? Is he not, rather, telling the story in his own way, and including details which are not found in Mark? The two first Evangelists picture the commandeering of Simon's services to go '*with them*' (R.V.) that he might take up (*ἵνα ἄρῃ*) the Cross. Luke sees the sequel. Simon had probably objected to the disgrace of the task given him to do, and so they laid hands (*ἐπιλαβόμενοι*) on him and placed the Cross on his shoulders to carry after Christ. *Φέρειν* is the most ordinary and natural word Luke could have written here to describe the action he wished to record. There is nothing in this passage, either in the narrative or in the choice of terms, to indicate that Luke had Mark's words in his mind at all.

Mark uses a common idiom when he employs *αἴρειν* ('to lift up') to imply the later, but distinct, action of carrying; just as all the four Evangelists use this same term in the story of the paralytic who was told to take up (Lk 5[24]—*ἆρας*) his bed and walk. But such an idiomatic usage affords no basis for arguing that *αἴρειν* must in all cases be taken to mean *φέρειν*.

It is interesting to note here in passing that, just as *αἴρειν* had acquired the special meaning of 'departing,' so also the Hebrew נָסַע ('to pull up or out') had developed, from pulling up the tent-pegs, the sense of 'setting out, departing' (see Lexicon: Brown, Driver, and Briggs). It is used so frequently in this sense in the Old Testament that we can safely conclude the metaphor was a perfectly familiar one to the Jews. Moreover, as a figure taken from a life with which every one of Christ's hearers was fully acquainted, even the simplest of His audience would find no difficulty in seizing the application when He called upon them 'to pull up your stake and follow me.'

Mr. Matheson sees in the phrase 'take up the Cross' only a readiness to die for the King. Are we not apt to make mistakes by insisting on what *we* see in a parable or a figure, whereas the important thing is to get at what the Teacher Himself knew His hearers would see in it? If 'Cross' be

the only rendering that can be given to the word σταυρὸς, what could the phrase have possibly conveyed to those peasants of Galilee? I believe the effect of such words on their minds would be twofold:

(1) Utter confusion on being invited, even in a metaphor, to face a cruel and immediate death (for the Cross was never carried by a prisoner except when he was on the way to execution), and to become the most dreadful object a Jew could think of—'the curse of God' (see Dt 21^{23}, Ac 5^{30}, Gal 3^{13}).

(2) As crucifixion was not a Jewish custom but a Roman practice, they would see in the words an implied conflict with Rome.

The first of these could have had no power of appeal; the second was the very thing Christ did not want them to look for in the service of the 'kingdom.'

I read the phrase ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ in the light of the great emphasis Christ laid in His early preaching on the distinction between the 'world' and the 'kingdom,' and on their mutual exclusiveness. To drive this home to Nicodemus He used that striking metaphor, 'Ye must be born again.' Before professing the new allegiance there must be a clean cut away from the old, for even 'the friendship of the world is enmity with God.'

J. Davies Bryan.

Alexandria, Egypt.

Interpretation of 2 Kings viii. 10, 11.

Did Elisha really suggest the assassination of Benhadad? The famous scene between the prophet and Hazael, the envoy of the Syrian king, has raised certain difficulties owing partly to the text and partly to the interpretation of the passage. If we follow the K^{e}thîbh in v.^{10} (לֹא), we have a simple and straightforward oracle on Benhadad's health—'Thou shalt certainly not recover, and Yahweh has shewed me that he will certainly die.' This is an announcement of the king's death. When Hazael carries back the report, he deliberately falsifies it, converting it into a favourable oracle.

The Q^{e}rê (לוֹ), however, has the support of all the Versions, and is doubtless the original reading. Thus the oracle of Elisha gains a totally different significance: 'Say to him, thou shalt certainly recover, and Yahweh has shewed me that he will certainly die.' The oracle appears on the surface to be contradictory. Many scholars, *e.g.* Skinner in *The Century Bible*, see in the latter half a suggestion to Hazael, which he duly carried out by smothering Benhadad. Is this interpretation necessary? Is there not a simpler explanation?

V.^{11} supplies us with it, even although it brings forward other difficulties. The LXX has a text very similar to the Hebrew, reading, however, וַיַּעֲמֹד for וַיָּעֶם—'And he (Elisha) stood before him and fixed [his countenance] till he was ashamed.'

The Vulgate takes Hazael as subject, 'And (Hazael) stood before him, and was confused to the point of blushing,' *Conturbatus* representing וַיֵּשֶׁם of the Hebrew text, but pointed וַיֵּשֵׁם. What is this but the guilty confusion of the Syrian officer? Hazael was ashamed, because the prophet had read his secret thoughts.

Another view of v.^{11} has been offered, *e.g.*, in Moffatt's *Translation of the O.T.*: 'And he (Elisha) steadied his face (the stare of ecstasy), and was appalled (וַיֵּשֵׁם) in the extreme (עַד־בּוֹשׁ).' The phrase עַד־בּוֹשׁ, however, always involves a feeling of shame, cf. Jg 3^{25}, 2 K 2^{17}, and is unfitted to describe the horror falling on Elisha in view of the coming disasters. Besides, the position of איש אלהים as subject of the whole verse is most unusual in Hebrew.

The simplest explanation of the oracle is Elisha's reading of Hazael's guilty purpose. The disease of Benhadad was by no means fatal, but he was to die by some other means. The steady gaze of the prophet let Hazael understand the significance of the oracle. It is to be noted that Hazael suppressed the latter half of the message, and hurried on the assassination; for Benhadad was recovering. There is no need to suggest that Elisha inspired the crime, which was to bring such woes on Israel.

H. A. Williamson.

Lochee.

Note on ἀγαπάω and φιλέω

From a consideration of their use to translate the same Hebrew in Gn $37^{3.\ 4}$, Mr. Highfield concludes that the distinction usually made between these words cannot be maintained. To me, however, the change from ἀγαπάω to φιλέω suggests a nice discrimination on the part of the translators, rather than establishes an equality between the words. Jacob loved Joseph with a discerning love based upon his knowledge of the lad's character, and perhaps also because he anticipated for him a

peculiar place in the development of the Divine purposes, whereas the brethren could only perceive an inordinate affection in their father's treatment of his younger son.

παρὰ cum acc. institutes a comparison with the eleven; Jacob loved them all, but Joseph most of all, more than he loved any of the others. ἐκ presents the point of view of the eleven, to whom it seemed that Jacob loved Joseph to the exclusion of the rest. In making this distinction, which they did not find in the Hebrew, it seems the translators were psychologically correct.

In Jn 3^{35} 5^{20} again, the choice of words seems to be appropriate. In the former passage the speaker (or writer) has in mind the eternal relationship, the unchanging love of approbation based upon judgment, unemotional, deliberate, which was the cause of the timeless and unqualified committal of 'all things' to the Son, who is, as He ever has been, because of that love, the Revealer and the Agent of the Father.

In the latter passage the Lord is speaking as the Incarnate Son of His present relation to, and experience of, His Father. As the Father does and shows, the Son sees and does. The obedience of the Son, His subjection in all things to the Father, is reciprocated in the tender intimacy of affection.

After His resurrection the Lord demanded of Peter whether he loved Him with the love that faces the issue and, clear-eyed, at whatever cost, denies self (Jn $21^{15\text{-}17}$). Well Peter knows that he has shown the very reverse of this. But that he loves the Lord with the personal affection that comes from intimate association, he must, despite appearances, insist. We can, and do, hurt the objects of our affection, and often we sacrifice them to our own exigencies. But not so with the objects of that other, deeper love which is born of the will, and which proves itself in deliberate subordination of every self-interest to the interests of its object. Would the Lord acknowledge the poor affection that Peter claimed? So when the Lord met him upon his own ground and probed that claim also, the breaking-point was reached. Thereupon Peter appealed from his own affection to the love that is perfect in knowledge, that is never taken unawares by the wayward instability of the human heart, nor ever sterilized by it.

In committing His lambs to Peter's care the Lord acknowledged Peter's affection and encouraged him to hope that he would yet come to share the Good Shepherd's love, and find his opportunity to prove it in his care of the 'little ones' of the flock, even at the cost of his life.

C. F. Hogg.

Highgate.

Indignor quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus.

An apposite case occurs on p. 109 of Professor H. B. Swete's posthumous work, *The Parables of the Kingdom*. In a left-hand column one there reads the usual Greek account of 'the parable of the two sons.' One is amazed, however, on turning to the English rendering in the right-hand column, to find the story topsy-turvy. According to the English version it is the first son—the Jew's—who at the outset says, 'I will not,' but afterwards repents and goes. Consistently enough, the second son—the Gentile's—starts with a promise of obedience, but fails to implement his promise. This consistency is carried even to the length of making the bystanders give the palm to the first son.

J. R. Mackay.

Edinburgh.

Entre Nous.

Point and Illustration.

A book which should not be missed by the working minister is *What to Preach*, by the Rev. Henry Sloane Coffin, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). It contains five lectures which deal respectively with expository, doctrinal, ethical, pastoral, and evangelistic preaching. And to particularize further we might say that it is with the technique of preaching that the lectures deal. But Dr. Coffin knows that more is needed than technique. 'Never let us forget that it is flame, and flame in which a man's self is being consumed, which illumines and warms. And that this may never die down let us tell ourselves that saying of Christ's which evangelists had not room for in their narratives, but which the memory of some disciple would not let go: "Whoso is near Me is near the fire."' Having made this clear, let us turn to some of Dr. Coffin's prac-

tical suggestions. He believes in illustration. Illustrate every type of sermon, no matter how difficult, he says. The doctrinal sermon has more need of illustration than any. Let us look at the way he illumines the two aspects of the Person of Christ—the religious experience of the Man Jesus and the incarnation of God in Him. 'A few years ago we were taught that light consisted of waves moving in a hypothetical ether; light, as Lord Kelvin cleverly put it, was "the nominative of the verb to undulate." More recently it has been discovered that light exerts a pressure which can be weighed, and we can speak of the number of tons of sunlight per annum received by our earth. This is very like Sir Isaac Newton's emanation theory. Both theories seem to be needed to account for light. Sir William Bragg writes: "On Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays we used the wave theory; on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays we think in streams of flying energy, quanta or corpuscles. That is, after all, a very proper attitude to take. We cannot state the whole truth, since we have only partial statements, covering a portion of the field. When we want to work in any one portion of the field or other, we must take out the right map. Some day we shall piece all the maps together."'

Or, take again an illustration of a different type. This time for the evangelistic sermon, where the preacher is trying to make men see how possible it is to know the unsearchable riches of Christ and still be a pauper in soul. It is 'the story of a Scotsman who played a rôle in the development of the State of California. His name was James W. Marshall. He had knocked about the world, seeking a living, and came to California, and found employment in a saw-mill in the Sacramento Valley. There in the year 1848, while watching the mill-race, he saw something shining in the sand and reached down and picked up several nuggets. He and his employer used the sulphuric acid test and convinced themselves it was gold. The news of his discovery flew over the land, and in 1849 occurred the rush to the gold fields. For several years many millions in gold were mined in that valley, and fortunes made. Marshall worked with the rest, and occasionally struck rich finds, but he never held on to his wealth for long. After some years he was discovered in poverty, and a small grant was made him by successive sessions of the legislature. But one day in the 'eighties a party of campers entered what appeared a deserted cabin not far from the spot where the gold had first been seen, and found his dead body. A monument—a big bronze effigy—was put up to his memory—the memory of one who discovered that which made many wealthy and himself died in abject penury.'

A picturesque text may be of great assistance. This is another of Dr. Coffin's points—the whole volume is full of suggestion. 'However a sermon arises in a man's mind—and many of them do not originate in texts—it is always the richer and more surely Christian for being well grounded in a passage of Scripture. A man may have in his mind some attitude towards life in his hearers which he wishes to correct. For example, they may have been caught in the current mental perplexity about religion and morals. They did not wish this state of blurred vision, but they have accepted it and now rather enjoy it, because it faces them with no insistent obligations, and permits them to relax and take life easily. He wishes to point out the perils of this mental and moral vagueness, and show them how with Christ there is always something clearly in sight. Well, let him take such a text as "The twilight that I desired hath been turned into trembling unto me." Let him point out how the hours after sunset in Babylon, so prized by glare-wearied men and women, in which they enjoyed themselves on their balconies or house-tops, became in a siege the most dreaded hours of the day, when Elamites and Medes could push their assault undetected amid the shadows. There will be a distinct gain to his sermon, not only from the picturesqueness of the text, which will grip his hearers' attention; but also the details of the scene depicted by the prophet will amplify his own treatment of the modern situation, and the depth and tragedy and spiritual earnestness of the ancient Scripture will carry him further in his portrayal of the contemporary danger than he would otherwise be taken. And against that striking background of twilight he will present more effectively Christ as the Light of life.'

Children's Sermons.

This month two good volumes of children's sermons have been published. The first is by the Rev. Albert D. Belden, B.D., who has just been appointed to Whitefields. Its title is *The Teachings of the King* (National Sunday School Union; 2s. net). Mr. Belden has the type of mind which is easily reminded of a story—a useful gift when speaking to children. This is the story from the address on 'The Merciful'—they are not all as good as this.

'But having mercy, being merciful, is not only

forgiving others: it is giving forth to others what ever help you can. Did you ever hear of the School for Sympathy?

'Isn't that a strange school? One of our great English essayists tells us all about it. The mistress's name was Miss Beam—just the sort to let light into anybody, eh? If you were to visit Miss Beam's school, this is what would happen. You would go to the window commanding the large garden and playground, and Miss Beam would ask you: "What do you see?" And you would reply: "I see a lot of jolly children in some beautiful grounds, but what puzzles me is that they are not all as healthy and active as I would like to see. I see one poor thing being led about—some trouble in her eyes, I suppose—and there are two more in the same condition—and, oh, there is a little girl with a crutch just under the window—what a hopeless cripple she is!"

'And then Miss Beam would laugh—yes, laugh heartily, and say: "Oh, no, she is not really lame, you know. This is her lame day. In the course of the term every child has one blind day, one lame day, one deaf day, one maimed day, one dumb day. During the blind day their eyes are bandaged absolutely, and it is a point of honour not to peep. The bandage is put on overnight—they wake blind. This means they need assistance in everything, and the other children lead them about."

'And then you would go into the playground, and going up to one of the little girls playing "blind," you would say: "Don't you ever peep?" "Oh, no, that would be cheating," is the answer you would get. "But I'd no idea it was so awful to be blind," the little one would say. "One feels one is going to be hit by something every moment. It's such a relief to sit down." "Are your guides kind to you?" you ask. Back comes the reply: "Pretty good; *not so careful as I shall be when it's my turn. Those who have played 'blind' already are the best.*"'

There is a Foreword to the volume by Dr. Hutton, who says Mr. Belden 'speaks to children that he may dispose them to open their hearts to Christ.'

The second volume of children's talks is by 'Uncle Oliver' of the New Zealand Baptist—the late Rev. Samuel Morris. The title is *A Handful of Nuts* (Allenson; 2s. 6d. net). Many suggestive ideas are here. If we turn to 'Tickets, Please!' we find three points. The common railway ticket has the destination of the traveller printed on it. We should know where we are going on this great journey we call life. And the next point is that tickets are not transferable, every one must have his own ticket. And then tickets have to be shown. 'We must show our tickets often on the journey to prove that we are true travellers, and every day our tickets are examined by some one. Our chums read it, and know by the way we play our games where we are going, for every one who is travelling the long road with Jesus will "play the game." Our ticket is read at home, at school, as well as in the street, and everywhere it is as though our very faces were stamped with the name of the place to which we are travelling. Lots of fellow-travellers are on the road to the city of the great King, and they will be helped along the road by the showing of our tickets. The boy who refuses to tell a lie, or do a mean thing; the girl who is not afraid that others shall see her allegiance to Christ the King—these show very plainly that they possess a ticket.'

If you want another idea, turn to 'The S—B—E Family':

'If there's any hard or unpleasant task,
Or difficult thing to do,
'Tis always offered to Somebody Else.
Now, isn't this very true?'

What the Church needs.

With unfailing regularity a volume of *The Christian World Pulpit* appears every six months. The present is the one hundred and tenth, and it contains no fewer than one hundred and sixty sermons and a number of meditations. The Bishop of Manchester contributes three addresses, the first in the volume being by him. Here is his mind on the ministry of women:

'At this time there can be little doubt that a special need, and I should say the greatest of all our needs, is to find the right opportunity of using—more fully than the Church has of late at least been using—the devotion and the gifts of women. We need more service from men, no doubt, we need to recruit the ministry of priests and deacons, we need it most urgently, but it would seem to me that the need which most of all presses upon us now, because it arises out of the characteristic development of the whole life of our time, is the need to find the right way in all its fullness of utilising the services of women in the Church.'

Slighted.

'I have often wished that there might be another maxim added to those which in our childhood

we wrote in our copy-books to form our handwriting, and this one would be: "If ever you feel slighted it proves that you deserve it." It is not quite true, perhaps, but it is certainly as true, I think, as such generalisations usually are. I expect all of us know of instances where we have seen work damaged, and, as I say, if we are only rather strict with ourselves, we can probably find times in our own career when our work was damaged, because we have let ourselves feel slighted. Self was intruded and made claims. We have not been ready merely to leave the issue in God's hands.' [1]

Experience.

'The sweet, startling voice which changes the lives of men, like the singing of *Pippa* as she passes in Browning's fine dramatic poem, has been heard by myriads since Augustine heard it, and is still heard to-day. "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to-day, yea, and for ever."

'Here is a passage from a letter written three or four years back: "One winter night I sat up late in my study, poring over the newest elaborate *apologia* for belief, until I fell asleep by the fire. Before daybreak a ploughman woke me on his way to work; as he tramped along the frosty road under my window he was singing, and I heard the words:

My God, the spring of all my joys,
The life of my delights,
The glory of my brightest days,
And comfort of my nights,
In darkest shades if Thou appear
My dawning is begun!
Thou art my soul's sweet morning star,
And Thou my rising sun!

'"Somehow, that hymn penetrated my heart with an unearthly thrill of conviction which none of the evidence-books could achieve. The philosophers might argue in favour of Theism: the ploughman was rejoicing in his experience of the love of God."

'And the writer of the letter?' [2]

James Stephens.

We confess to having had a feeling of disappointment when we opened *Collected Poems* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net). We had hoped to find some new poems. But at any rate, in this volume we have, so we are told, all which the author cares to preserve. And they are very good, so we must be content. They are arranged in subject sequence, and the first section, 'In Green Ways,' is one of the most characteristic, showing as it does Mr. Stephens' sympathy with nature. Do you know

LITTLE THINGS

Little things, that run, and quail,
And die, in silence and despair!

Little things, that fight, and fail,
And fall, on sea, and earth, and air!

All trapped and frightened little things,
The mouse, the coney, hear our prayer!

As we forgive those done to us,
—The lamb, the linnet, and the hare—

Forgive us all our trespasses,
Little creatures, everywhere!

From the second section we quote

SHAME

I was ashamed! I dared not lift my eyes!
I could not bear to look upon the skies!
What I had done! Sure, everybody knew!
From everywhere hands pointed where I stood,
And scornful eyes were piercing through and through
The moody armour of my hardihood!

I heard their voices too, each word an asp
That buzz'd and stung me sudden as a flame!
And all the world was jolting on my name!
And now and then there came a wicked rasp
Of laughter, jarring me to deeper shame!

And then I looked, and there was no one nigh!
No eyes that stabbed like swords or glinted sly!
No laughter creaking on the silent air!
—And then I saw that I was all alone
Facing my soul! And next I was aware
That this mad mockery was all my own!

Wilfrid Gibson.

The note at the beginning of *Collected Poems, 1905–1925* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net), says: 'This volume contains all his work, published during the last twenty years, that the author cares to reprint.' There are two surprises here. The first is that it is anything like twenty years since Mr. Gibson published his first volume, and the second, that his output has been so great. For here is a crown octavo volume containing eight hundred pages. Plays—though not intended for staging—epics,

[1] The Bishop of Manchester.
[2] W. Canton, *Yesterday, To-day, and For Ever*, 25.

odes, lyrics, all are here. A number of the shorter poems were inspired by the War and we are inclined, through a sudden change of feeling, to pass them by. But let us read them, for it is not by forgetting that the ideal of 'no more war' will be attained.

LAMENT.

We who are left, how shall we look again
Happily on the sun or feel the rain,
Without remembering how they who went
Ungrudgingly, and spent
Their all for us, loved too the sun and rain?

A bird among the rain-wet lilac sings—
But we, how shall we turn to little things,
And listen to the birds and winds and streams
Made holy by their dreams,
Nor feel the heart-break in the heart of things?

Frank Kendon.

Mr. Kendon has written *A Life and Death of Judas Iscariot* (John Lane; 6s. net) in blank verse. It is a dignified and worthy treatment of the subject. Perhaps the point of most interest is the motive he attributes to Judas. It is not avarice, although Mr. Kendon takes account of that as an imputation which was actually made and honestly believed. In the Preface he gives his reading of Judas's character. 'Circumstances (it is supposed) drive him into introspection; his whole disaffection is with himself, and the betrayal is an attempt, made in desperation, to prove to himself that he is capable of action. It is an effort to resolve his importunate doubts about his power, and his suicide shows that it failed. In such a mind, however, it would be impossible for this to be honestly recognized as the motive. The political reasoning, with Jesus and with the priest, is seized upon by Judas as a possible intellectual motive. I have tried to show how artificial and yet how reasonable this was in him. His passion from first to last was for himself. He was incapable of disinterest, although intelligent enough to see that disinterest was the only just way of life. He was always attempting to convince his audience, but he was not an ordinary hypocrite, because the only audience for which, by habit of life, he had any respect was himself.'

As some fugitive
Who has ventured at the bidding of a fiend
Further and further into dreadful lands—
Rank tangled sweating noonday darkness—comes
At evening, sick of his own company,
Upon a turbulent stream, where black and glassy
Waters seem to offer cool relief
To fevers of the air, endured too long;
As such a one might madly leap therein
To battle with the embracing currents, and sink
At last: So Judas to the torrent leapt,
The torrent of unreason, urged far more
By loathing of himself than hate of truth.
For when the Feast of Passover was held,
And Jesus sat at table with them all,
Judas, a silent envy, one of the twelve,
Felt the mad passion rise and master him.
His eyes beheld their love; he was enforced
To hear their protestations, their night fears
Of treachery; and every faithful word
Darkened his jealous spirit. At that time
All personal love lay blind within him, blind
If not quite dead, and he was calm.
Therefore when Jesus, who was pale with grief,
Spoke, saying, 'One who sits at meat with us
Shall soon betray me.' Judas rose and left
The rest, protesting 'Master, is it I?'
As they protested, left in deadly calm
Those innocent accusers and their idol.
Evening it was, the streets through which he passed
Were almost empty, though the sun still hung
In perfect circle on the round hilltops.
To right or left not looking, yet he marked
The lizards on the weedy walls he passed,
And heard the crying of a baby, or
The shout of one boy to another. All
The world of minutes bit into a mind
Bent upon sick revenge; and he was calm.
For purpose, though so cruel, gave relief
To all the empty years of vacillation.
Up to the Temple steps he climbed, the spot
Where, but a day or two ago, he stood
To hear the priests rebuked, and at a door
Known to him since his foul temptation, he knocked.

Correction.

Kindly note that the publishers of *The Hidden Centuries*, by Mr. Edward A. Annett, are the National Sunday School Union. In our review last month the name of Messrs. Hunter & Longhurst was given.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

The emergence of aggressive Fundamentalism in America has given fresh interest to the question as to the relations of Science to Religion. Several histories of the old conflict and several new discussions of the grounds of controversy have recently appeared. A thoroughly adequate résumé of the dispute is given in *The Church and Science*, by Hector Macpherson, M.A., Ph.D., in the 'Living Church' series (Clarke; 6s. net).

As may be gathered from the title, it deals with the action of ecclesiastical authorities and the utterances of representative churchmen, and it makes rather humiliating reading. It is not exhilarating to have it so clearly demonstrated how dogmatic, how ignorant, and how merciless were the judgments of the Church on questions of astronomy, geology, and biology, and looking back from our vantage-point in time to see how wrong-headed, indeed how faithless, their criticisms were. If such an historical survey could be widely circulated among the extreme Fundamentalists, one would hope that they might take warning. We are tempted, however, to take a rather wider view than the author, who has performed his own strictly defined task with such marked ability to our entire satisfaction.

In the conflict, Science *v.* The Church, Science has won, and most churchmen on this side the water acquiesce. Deeper things, however, are involved when we ask, how has it fared with religion, especially popular religion? Some glibly say, 'The marches are now cleared; there is no conflict; Religion and Science can go on each keeping to its own sphere, doing no manner of hurt the one to the other.' That is easily said, but is it quite true?

It is not true of the religion of the man in the street. To him religion is largely a way of getting things done. He prays if his need is fairly desperate. Now Science has come in as a sure way of getting things done. How get rid of malaria? Science answers, 'You *may* pray, but you *must* destroy the mosquitoes.' Hence, as an American Professor said recently, it is increasingly difficult to appreciate the need of God. Granted that such a view, regrettable in the mouth of a Professor, rests on a profound misunderstanding of religion and of God's place in the Universe, it is true that to the ordinary man it is not plain that prayer is so necessary or useful as he used to think it might be; nor is he so sure of God's activity.

Take the easiest illustration, petitionary prayer. That is quite definitely prayer for getting things done. Is it more sensible to pray for a change of weather than it would be to pray that to-morrow's sun might rise an hour earlier? If with Fosdick we are to rule out petitions about weather, what else are we to rule out? or rather, what petitions can we retain? Science discovers the sure way of getting things done, and to the truly religious

mind Science is God's revelation of how those particular things should be done. Is prayer, then, to become just a communing with God with self-surrender to His will, or is there still a place for petition? That is a problem, far from new indeed, but one to which modern science has given a sharpness and an obviousness which it never had before.

Again, we might show how difficult it is to get Science and Religion to keep to the separate compartments which the popular Apologist has assigned them, by recalling that there are sciences which deal with religion, its history and its psychology. It is the new psychology, with its anatomizing of the religious life, that is most disturbing to-day. In comparison with the vital questions now raised, the old controversy, Genesis *v.* Geology, is almost trivial. In the old conflict religion was defended by a masterly retreat from untenable positions involving the supposedly scientific teaching of a supposedly inerrant book, and a fortifying of what seemed the impregnable position of the inner testimony of the human spirit. But the whole nature, and in consequence the authority, of that inner spirit is now the subject of investigation, doubt, and controversy.

The conflict is not over, the possibility of conflict may never be got over. For our comfort let us ask what is happening as the result of it all. Not this, that we have had to surrender one element of religion after another till a vanishing-point is within sight. But this, that we are becoming increasingly aware of what precisely religion is, what Scripture is, and what is the real value of both; and increasingly confident that all the 'explanation' of ourselves and of the world which Science gives, or can ever hope to give, is not all the explanation which we need.

Recent times have seen the production of 'Lives' of Christ that have possessed features of special interest. Three especially are worthy of mention for a particular reason, Papini's 'Story of Christ,' Middleton Murry's 'Life,' and the most recent of all, Dr. WARSCHAUER'S *Historical Life* (reviewed in another column). The first was by a man of peculiar gifts, almost entirely ignorant of critical methods and results, but with a vision that set Jesus, as he saw Him, before us with extraordinary vividness. It was a work of remarkable genius. There has been nothing like it.

Mr. Murry's biography was the expression of a deep and almost worshipful admiration. It was the literary man's tribute to the greatness of Jesus. The writer was not quite so ignorant of criticism as Papini, but his knowledge might have been written down in a comparatively small space. And, as in the first case, more knowledge might have saved him from some of his worst mistakes. Dr. WARSCHAUER, again, sets out with a definite picture in his mind, that of the Christ who was an apocalyptist modified by spiritual intuitions. This writer is, unlike the others, a trained scholar, and his book has the marks of an expert all over it. But the point we wish to make is that it is also a book based on an idea.

Here we have three portraits of Jesus, that of an Italian Roman Catholic, that of a more or less agnostic literary man, and that of a rationalist with a theory. The Christ they depict for us is in each case different, because they find different things in Him. What Dr. WARSCHAUER says of the Virgin Birth stories—which he rejects—is true of all these 'Lives': 'What must have been the quality of a Life to which such an Origin was attributed? They are trustworthy testimonies, not to the reality of certain incidents, but to the quality and magnitude of Jesus' character.'

As a matter of fact, the same variety, within limits, is found in the New Testament. It is a mistake to imagine that there is only one picture of Christ in the New Testament. There are at least three. There is the Synoptic picture of the Jesus who went about doing good. Not a mere man, for the Gospels were written by those who believed in His Deity. But it is His humanity that is emphasized, and especially His human

love and interest in those who were needy. This is the source of all the representations of Jesus in modern art. It is a definite picture.

The Johannine picture is quite different. It is that of a supernatural Being. It is the Word made flesh, and it is always that. It is not suggested here that the Johannine picture is less true to the Reality, but just that it is different. John found something different in Jesus. It is a picture of the Son of God, and we are never allowed to forget His heavenly origin and heavenly nature. It is a different vision from that of the Synoptists.

Then there is the Pauline Christ, who is in some ways different from both the others. It is the crucified and risen Lord. The Cross is the centre of the Lord's life for Paul. How much he knew of the earthly life we do not know. He knew a great deal probably. But he ignored it largely. The earthly ministry for Paul was the Cross, and the Resurrection was largely the vindication of the Crucified. Christ was He who died for us and rose again. The Pauline Christ is a different vision, because Paul found this different thing in Christ.

As a fact we need the three visions or pictures to show us the One. We need the human ministry, the supernatural glory, and the Cross: they are all in Christ. It is surprising how one-sided our conception of Christ is apt to become. Take the conventional portrait of Jesus in art and in pictures in our schools and books for children. Is that the real Jesus? It cannot be. It is weak and effeminate. It may be the portrait of the Jesus who blessed children, but it is not the portrait of the Jesus who scourged the traffickers out of the Temple. It would be a good thing if this conventional and traditional portrait of Jesus could be got rid of.

How different is, *e.g.*, the face of Jesus in Titian's 'Tribute Money.' A wonderful face, tender, gentle, thoughtful, but also strong and full of power. That is the real Jesus. We have to take the Jesus with a child in His arms *and* the Jesus with a scourge in His hands in the Temple if we are to see Him as He was. And perhaps that is the real value of all these 'Lives' of Christ. They all have their own 'vision,' their own picture; and there is truth, some truth, in them all. And as we read them we must not allow our differences from them to blind us to the truth they embody. For we too may say, 'What must have been the quality of a life that draws so many eyes and in which so many souls find so much that is great.'

Alike over critics, historians, moralists, and the common people, the Decalogue exercises a perpetual fascination. The critic endeavours to discover its original form, the historian traces its influence through the history of the Hebrew people and through the subsequent history of Christianity, the moralist asks in what sense, if in any, it may be regarded as an epitome of human duty, while the common man regards it as the adequate and indestructible basis of all individual, social, and national life.

The unabated interest in the critical and historical study of it and in its applicability to modern life has been attested by several books that have recently appeared. Four years ago we had Archdeacon Charles's Warburton Lectures on the Decalogue, quite recently we had a monograph in French from the pen of Professor Gampert, on the 7th of last November Professor Meinhold chose the Decalogue as the subject of his rectorial address at the University of Bonn, and now the Rev. H. J. Flowers, B.A., B.D., brings before us *The Permanent Value of the Ten Commandments*, in a volume of 283 pages, published at 7s. 6d. net by Messrs. Allen & Unwin.

The French and German studies are mainly critical, and the uncertainty which besets Old Testament studies is seen in the widely divergent conclusions to which these scholars have come—Gampert championing the Mosaic, and Meinhold the exilic, origin of the Decalogue. Characteristically the English writers are interested in the practical value of the Decalogue, Mr. Flowers almost exclusively so, while Dr. Charles in his

discussion combines that interest with a thorough investigation of the critical problem. His words, indeed, are deeply significant of the pragmatical character of the English mind. 'Deeply as I have been interested,' he says, 'in the critical and historical study of the Decalogue, it has been my main aim to reinterpret the Decalogue on the spiritual and ethical lines already laid down in the New Testament, and to apply its lessons to the crying needs of our own day.'

Something like this is also the aim of Mr. FLOWERS' book, as its title would sufficiently indicate. Occasional touches show that he is not unfamiliar with the critical problems, but it is on the permanent value of the Decalogue that he has chosen to concentrate. Historical origin, as he truly says, is one thing, and inherent worth quite another. He knows that there is a danger of reading both too much and too little into the ten commandments, as into other great words of the Old Testament. He admits that 'there is no reason whatever for disputing that originally they meant what they said and very little more.' But he justly claims that we have the right to interpret them in the light that revelation and history have thrown upon them.

That is to say, for example, that the seventh commandment, which in itself only forbids adultery, may be taken, and in the light of Christian thought ought to be taken, as forbidding any and every kind of unchaste action and thought. And the ninth commandment, which, taken strictly, prohibits the giving of false evidence in the law courts, may be legitimately held to cover no less the prohibition of 'slander, calumny, detraction, blackmail, and misrepresentation of every sort.' We are the children of history; and the real meaning of the commandments is not only the meaning which the critical student of their origin may prove that they ultimately bore, but also the meaning which they have come to acquire for the enlightened Christian conscience.

A comprehensive study of the Decalogue like that of Mr. FLOWERS brings us face to face with many live modern problems, and the writer does not miss his opportunity. The eighth commandment, *e.g.*, brings up the whole question of property. On this he has many sane and useful things to say. Regarding property as part of the Divine order through which men express and realize their personality, he offers some trenchant criticisms of communism as 'the politics of sentiment.' It is a system which has appealed not infrequently to the moral and religious thinker, but it has rarely commended itself to the professional economist, and it has no real support in the early Christian society described in Acts, for that was not built on the compulsory surrender of private possessions.

But it is worth while to point out, as Mr. FLOWERS does point out, that there are more thieves abroad than those who pick our pockets. Essentially a man is a thief who robs society of the service he is fitted and entitled to render, and essentially a man is not greatly better than a murderer and should be visited with drastic punishment, who adulterates food or drugs, thereby endangering the health of the community, and it may even be the lives of individuals, or who does or permits or authorizes or connives at the doing of scamped work, or the use of shoddy material, which may lead to fatal accidents. He refers to the law in the code of Hammurabi that, if a badly built house falls on the owner and kills him, the builder is put to death, and grimly adds, 'We could well copy the spirit of the Babylonian Law against jerry-building.'

The discussion of the second commandment leads Mr. FLOWERS into a searching analysis of image-worship. He knows all that can be said in favour of the crucifix as an aid to devotions and of the adoration of the Virgin and Child, and he deals with the arguments not unsympathetically; but he ends with a resolute rejection of all such practices. The constant contemplation of the crucifix at devotions tends to localize Christ, and, further, to concentrate attention on the wrong symbol of Christianity, the true symbol being not a cross, but a heavenly throne; while the adoration of the Virgin, besides undermining the purity of Christian worship and the uniqueness of Christ,

introduces an intermediary between man and God.

The writer's intensely Protestant convictions further come out in the statement that he regards 'with the utmost contempt and suspicion the constant attempts that are made to attach priestly functions to Nonconformist ministers.'

There are a few points at which we disagree both with Mr. Flowers' thought and with his language. We do not, for example, like to hear of God 'butting into' the plans of men, nor of His 'hammering certain facts home to them.' Nor are we quite sure that he puts the case well when he says that 'in order to witness to the worth of the family, Israel had to believe in the worthlessness of the individual.' 'Relative unimportance' would surely have been nearer the truth than 'worthlessness.'

Nor is the following sentence beyond challenge: 'The wars of extirpation carried out against the Canaanites were in accordance with the command of God, and were in the nature of punishment upon the enemy for their cruelty and idolatry.' But what of the cruelty of these very extirpations? And what of the treatment of Adoni-bezek? The truth is that the Jahweh who was believed to have commanded these massacres was practically on the level of the Chemosh of the Moabite Stone. These, however, are but little points in a book that cannot fail to be full of suggestion to the preacher, and that deserves the eulogy of Dr. Moffatt which appears on the wrapper of the book.

The Parable of the Unjust Judge (Luke xviii. 1–8).

By Professor J. A. Robertson, D.D., United Free Church College, Aberdeen.

This parable is a companion picture to that of the man outside a locked door at midnight trying to borrow three loaves to feed an unexpected guest (Lk 11^{5-8}). They were probably originally spoken by Jesus at the same time, this one of the Unjust Judge following that of the Unfriendly Friend. Luke makes the story of the Unjust Judge follow a discourse on the Parousia, possibly because he found an apocalyptical conclusion attached to the parable, or because he got both from the same source—had listened to some Christian preacher, an early follower of Jesus, some prophetic voice, Silas or some other, discoursing on our Lord's predictions of the end. Certainly the closing verses do sound like some Christian prophet's attempt to press home the moral of the story.

But the kinship with the parable of the Unfriendly Friend is unmistakable. In both we find a needy suppliant and a reluctant bestower; in both there is a touch of the Master's humour; and both end with a complete breakdown of the reluctance. Here, however, in the parable of the Unjust Judge all the lines and shadows are hardened and intensified. In the earlier parable we are listening to a friend begging from a friend on a friend's behalf. In this case we are listening to a Jewish widow, one of the most helpless and unprotected creatures on God's earth, petitioning a callous beast, who happened to be the city's judge, for justice against some wolf of a man who was taking a cruel advantage of her unprotectedness. We are away from the circle of human friendship, out amid the cold and blighting winds of enmity. The widow had no bribe to offer the judge, and he had no sense of justice and apparently none of the milk of human kindness about him.

It is one's own impression that both these stories are founded on experiences which Jesus Himself had shared. They are memory echoes of the early days in Nazareth. In the one there is the family atmosphere of protection and freedom from care which Mary shared with her children, while the hard-working, conscientious husband Joseph was alive. The other is perhaps the guarded memory of the blackest hour in the long grim days when the widow and her eldest-born, without protection now, exposed to all the bitter and relentless winds of man's inhumanity to man, toiled and struggled to keep the little home together. How often is that word 'widow' upon Jesus' lips! And was the enemy of that Nazareth home perchance some pious money-grubbing Pharisee, who devoured

widows' houses, trying to sell the house over her head to get what was not his own?

A widow! The word conjures up before our Western eyes a vision of the long, black, trailing weeds of sorrow. In many an instance, and certainly in this case, it brings to mind also a story of poverty and need. Darkest shadow of all—the very fact that this widow stands before a minister of law, clamouring for justice, means that she is a hunted, wounded thing, hard-pressed and cruelly wronged. Sorrow, care, need, unprotectedness, the 'sense of wrong and outrage desperate'—these are the conditions out of which this anguished prayer springs.

But before passing away from the comparison of the two parables, let us think for a moment further of the two men to whom the prayers for help were directed. In the earlier case we listen with an amused smile to the lame excuses of laziness for a refusal that is certainly going to break down. Are they not the things that a man in the ill-humour of being half awake would say? 'The door is already barred'—as if it were any harder to unbar at midnight than at daybreak; 'and my children are with me in bed'—as though he were unwilling to disturb or waken them, and yet he was shouting through the room to a man outside the door: one little pair of ears at least were alert and listening in Nazareth. Such is the Master's touch of humour in this parable. But in the other case we hear no uttered word of refusal. We are called on to contemplate that most dreadful of all refusals—silence. In the stillness of that house of law, we seem to see the judge with lowering brows listen for one impatient moment to the querulous, tearful entreaty. And then with a shrug of the shoulders and a lifting of the eyebrows in annoyance and disdain, he deliberately turns his back upon the insignificant suppliant, and with brutal rudeness stalks away. And though we wait long in that silent chamber, though we watch the poor petitioner come again and yet again with ever loud and louder outcries, still the same answer, the awful refusal of the stony silence that breaks the heart and turns it too to stone.

It is a fiercely drawn picture of a certain mood in prayer. It reminds us of some of the ancient Hebrew Psalms. 'How long wilt thou forget me, O Lord? For ever? How long wilt thou hide thy face from me? How long shall I take counsel in my soul, having sorrow in my heart daily? How long shall mine enemy be exalted over me? Consider and hear me, O Lord my God: lighten mine eyes lest I sleep the sleep of death: lest mine enemy say, I have prevailed against him; and those that trouble me rejoice when I am moved.' It is the mood that sometimes comes when men have been standing in the great audience-chamber of the Universe, and their eyes are too dim with sorrow, too dark with the tragedy of a broken world, to discern the figure of the Judge upon the bench; and out of the great, blank, empty silence only the echo of their own cries seems to come back to mock them. It is to this mood the Master addresses Himself here. And His counsel is to keep on praying. The purpose of the parable is, in the words of the Evangelist's editorial comment at the beginning of the story, to urge 'that men ought always to pray, and not to faint.' For, according to Jesus, such persistent prayer sooner or later is crowned with success. We must note at the outset how He makes His story end. The widow's prayer was granted, at last. Even in this desperate and seemingly hopeless case, where all the facts were dead against the petitioner, the prayer was granted —because she persevered.

In those old headings to the chapters in our King James' version, this parable has been named 'the importunate widow.' And it is a right human instinct that has named it so. For the story is meant to teach the value of importunity, the real spiritual efficacy of a kind of sanctified presumptuousness in prayer. The widow has been accused, indeed, of impudence, because she did not take time to use a flowery circumlocution, because she did not address the gentleman on the bench with proper ceremony, and call him, 'My Lord.' But real distress knows no ceremony. It goes straight to the point. And it persists in coming back to the point, again and again. She had got long past the stage of proffering a humble request. She had got beyond even the stage of urgent entreaty. Her prayer had grown to be a loud complaint which was almost an imprecation. We may not write her down perhaps as an angry fury; but she was at least a little, piteous, hustling storm of wind and rain, which kept repeating itself. The Divine Artist has made it very clear that she was out to pester and annoy the man, to compel him to take action in spite of himself. And, startling though it may appear, it is precisely this quality in her prayer that Jesus is commending to our earnest attention. The conclusion to which we are forced back in the end is that of the virtue, the usefulness, nay, the success of importunity in prayer.

'Hear what the unrighteous judge saith,' the Master bids us. We now turn, therefore, to take close scrutiny of the judge's words. And as we look

at them, the petty selfishness of them, the frank and sordid meanness, the cynicism, the blasphemy, we are forced to remind ourselves that Christ is drawing no comparison between this judge and God. He *is* thinking no doubt of God as a Judge, an honourable and upright Judge in a universe governed by laws of strict justice. And it is no unworthy title to apply to God. A judge is set to be the guardian of law and order, a terror to evil-doers, the protector of the injured and the wronged. And we recall the fact that an old Hebrew poet, in a hymn of adoration (Ps. 68), can find no nobler name to praise God by: 'A Father of the fatherless, a Judge of the widows is God in his holy habitation.' A Judge of the widows! But this man in the parable had mistaken his vocation: a judge that was no judge.

And let us, at Jesus' bidding, listen to his soliloquy (Luke is fond of recording soliloquies: witness his parables of the Rich Fool, the Prodigal Son, and the Vineyard Owner). Let us listen to the dreadful character he gives himself: 'I fear not God, neither regard man . . . this woman annoys me.' An atheist, whose denial of the fear of God indicates the extreme degree of religious and moral corruption. A cynical misanthrope, quite shameless in the face of his fellows. An egotist, concerned only about his own selfish ease and comfort. Self—that was the source and spring of all the motives by which his life seemed to be guided. He felt it would be a toil to set the apparatus of justice in motion, and he would gain nothing in his own interests. And we are just about to turn away from the ugly picture with a feeling of utter hopelessness, when the Master pulls us up again: 'I beg you to hear what the unjust judge says.' We must have missed something. Then a light begins to dawn, and we follow the gleam till at the end we are constrained to break into a ripple of laughter. Let us listen again to him. The man is talking to himself. Short, gruff, laconic phrases he is muttering. A lonely, crusty old man. And ever that hoarse croak falls on the ear: 'God! What do I care for God? Mankind! I have no interest in mankind.' And just at that moment the door is pushed open, and immediately there is a shrill, strident voice: 'Redress, redress! Free me from the clutches of my enemy! Legal satisfaction! Justice, justice!' And there is a movement in the room, and the old harsh voice growing louder and harsher: 'Dear me! is that the woman again? Will I never get rid of her? Why won't she leave me alone?'

When men tell us that our Lord never made use of the high gift of humour, we are driven back to this story among others, and it will not let us pass without a smile. 'Hear what the unjust judge saith.' Closely scan the closing words of his soliloquy. 'This widow troubles me'—what a nuisance she is! 'I will avenge her'—I had better settle her case. 'Lest by her continual coming she weary me' (so our Authorized Version renders the clause). Almost literally the Greek means, 'in case, coming back and back, at last she strike me black and blue in the face.' Lest she get more and more persistent, and end by giving me two black eyes.

And with these words we seem to catch sight of the man, and are just in time to see the last fleeting gleam of a smile on his usually stern, forbidding face. In that whimsical gleam of ironical self-pity the man stands before us self-betrayed. All that stern outward aspect, all that bullying bluster, all that fiercely muttered soliloquy are just a mask, an assumed mask which he has all but succeeded in persuading himself to be his real self. A Mephistopheles disguised in human form he seems to regard himself. 'You have no idea what a terrible fellow I am,' he seems to say. 'I am a cynic, utterly regardless of mankind.' And with bulging eyes, as if he would fain make our flesh creep, he whispers huskily, 'I am an atheist.' It is really a sham, even though he may have persuaded himself he is quite in earnest.

And that brings us to the heart of the meaning of this parable. It was the woman's importunity, her brazen refusal to be put off with the cold shoulder, that broke down the mask at last. The woman refused to believe that there was not a spark of humanity lying hidden somewhere still in the man's apparently selfish heart. And she was right. It was more than mere outward annoyance. There was a little prick of conscience disturbing the man's inward peace as well. A thoroughly selfish being would only have found a malicious amusement in the woman's daily tears and cries.

But importunity of this sort in prayer? we are fain here to ask. Is it not an unseemly attitude of mind? And Christ answers, reluctance to beg even of your fellow-men for some good cause means suspicion on your part. It means that you are unwilling to give the uncertain friendliness of the world the benefit of the doubt. Of course he who is not ashamed to beg hard for some good object *is* presumptuous. He presumes upon the essential goodness of mankind. But surely that is, in itself, a noble thing. It is exercising faith in human friendliness, in the brotherhood of man. And as a matter of fact this confiding urgency of appeal to

men, while it may meet with an occasional rebuff, is in the main rewarded. Men are surprised into a smiling generosity by the persistent beggar. They are agreeably amused at him, because he is paying them a very high compliment. And in trying to persuade them that they are more generous men than they think they are, he wakens the better self in them.

But the point of the parable is, How does the case stand when we apply all this to God? Dare we be forward and importunate with Him? Does it not seem to be the very thing the Master is bidding His followers here to be? His argument is that it would be the height of unfaith, not to presume—not to form the presumption—that God is essentially and altogether good. His argument is *a minori ad maius*. How much more ought we to exercise importunity with God than with men. When there is no importunity in prayer to God, no persistent sincerity of desire, Christ seems to say, men are guilty of a terrible suspicion about God. They are listening, with the ear of the soul awake, in the long unbroken silence of the Justice-chamber of the Universe, and they are allowing dark shadows of suspicion to gather in their hearts. Then they are projecting those shadows out into the void: they are imagining that God is altogether like this sour, warped soul, this misanthropic, selfish judge. That is what Christ drew in this parable—not *His* picture of God, but man's, with his suspicion, his lack of faith.

The apparently sinister indifference of the world of Nature with its iron laws, man sometimes thinks, is God saying to him: 'I am an austere, hard person; do not come plaguing me with your prayers.' It is the nonsense of unfaith to think so, Jesus says. The Eternal Will is set constantly in the direction of His people's highest good. As long as men imagine otherwise, they are bound to faint and grow slack in prayer. And so long as they do that, they fail to provide the very condition and opportunity in which the kindest and most generous Heart in all the Universe can break through the hard mask of Nature, or rather men's illusions about Nature, to answer their prayers. Importunity toward God is the sublime refusal to believe that God is anything else but fatherly, in spite of all appearances to the contrary. Humble importunity toward God in prayer is childlike faith in the eternal and inexhaustible fatherliness of God. God is the infinite Father, holy and just in all His ways, teaching His children to ask. He withholds His best gifts until we learn to ask with sincerity. He withholds the holiest desires of our heart until we learn to ask for them with all our heart. Because only so shall we be fitted to receive them. The gates of the Kingdom of Everlasting Satisfaction are only to be unlocked by real prayer. And only the strongest and most persistent prayer can turn the key that opens the door into the treasure-house of God's most precious jewels. For it is to be remembered that the barriers against entrance to that heavenly treasure-house are man-made barriers. The Christ of glory bends with yearning agony over the world to-day, but all the surge of His mighty healing spirit will be lost in the quicksands of hate and despair unless men open a way for it by their prayers.

The closing verses, reflecting the consciousness of the early Church, are difficult to interpret, especially that despairing sigh with which the parable in its present form ends: 'Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?' Perhaps, as Dr. A. T. Cadoux has pointed out, these verses represent a mistranslation from the Aramaic, and should be read: 'I tell you, he would avenge them speedily; but then would the Son of man, when He comes, find faith on the earth?' God's delays are a condition for the growth of faith. That would bring the present ending into line with the teaching of the parable. 'God does feel the wrongs of humanity—is long-suffering over them' (a probable gloss in the text)—'and will stop the injustice as soon as possible, but if He does so immediately, what possibility would faith have of making good its place in the world? . . . If God permitted no undeserved suffering in His world, faith in goodness, and, with it, all spiritual triumph, would be impossible.'

Literature.

A NEW LIFE OF CHRIST.

Dr. J. Warschauer, favourably known for previous contributions to theology, has now produced what must be described as his *magnum opus: The Historical Life of Christ* (Unwin; 15s. net). He admits frankly that of these lives there has been, and promises to be, no end. But his apologia for adding another is reasonable enough. His is from a new standpoint. It is an *Apocalyptic* life of Christ. He has set himself to apply the theory of Schweitzer to the ministry of Jesus in detail. And he has, in any case, produced a very readable book, marked by two things which predispose any one favourably. First, he has mastered the literature, and at every point shows himself a competent investigator. And, further, he has the indispensable qualification for any one who writes on this theme, a profound reverence for Christ. Indeed, his language, when he speaks of our Lord, is so emphatic in its profession of reverent faith that one constantly wonders in reading the book where he finds the basis for this faith.

Needless to say, the 'life' is entirely modern. It is modern in its rejection of miracle. But it would seem as if the writers who refuse the miraculous do stand in need sometimes of a sense of humour. In writing of the Stilling of the Tempest, for example, Dr. Warschauer suggests that Jesus was none too gently roused from sleep, and, seeing the disciples in wild excitement, shouting and wailing, He addressed His rebuke, not an idyllic 'Peace, be still!' but a sharp 'Silence, get muzzled!' to the ringleader of the noise and not to the tempest. 'And the wind ceased, and there was a great calm,' and Dr. Warschauer adds, 'A coincidence, indeed, but life is full of coincidences.' Would not a slight sense of humour have saved him from this?

We hasten to say that the book is not on this level at all. It has a serious contribution to make, and its contribution, briefly, is that Jesus began His ministry sharing the apocalyptic views of His age. He seems to have retained this standpoint all through as a kind of framework. But the author feels constrained to admit what largely vitiates his main contention, that Jesus filled this framework with a teaching that was purely spiritual and timeless. Along with his main point the author holds (what indeed follows) that Jesus, when He spoke of the Son of Man, did not mean Himself. He used the third person because He referred to a third person. We seem frequently to come in sight of Mr. Middleton Murry's bizarre idea that Jesus thought He was to *become* the Son of Man after His death.

The fact on which theories of this kind wreck themselves is the narrative of the Temptation. It seems obvious that the essence of the Temptation was just the conflict in the Lord's mind between the traditional view of what Messiah was to be and do, and His own higher vision of God's will. What is the meaning of the Devil's suggestion on 'the high mountain'? The story implies that Jesus fought His fight there and won. He came out with the traditional view of Messiah's function firmly rejected. There is nothing in this elaborate discussion by Dr. Warschauer that can stand against that. And if anything in the Gospels is genuine, surely this story, which must have come from Jesus Himself, is so. Dr. Warschauer suggests that the Temptation narrative has been modified. But that is too easy. It is surely the 'last ditch' when such a passage is dealt with in this way.

We find ourselves in conflict with the writer at many points, especially when he is original, as in his account of the Lord's Baptism. The handling of the Resurrection narrative is too drastic, and the explanation of the despair of the disciples after the Crucifixion is as inadequate as that of others. He suggests that Christ's predictions of His Resurrection were not so definite as the records show. This lets the disciples down gently, too gently. Is it not simpler and truer to point to a fact which every preacher has found to his dismay, that when you declare to people a truth which is novel or unpalatable, they simply do not take it in? It is an amazing fact, but it is perfectly familiar. Dr. Warschauer adheres to the Vision hypothesis in his treatment of the Resurrection stories, and it appears very bald and unconvincing in his hands. But he himself evidently believes in a living Christ, on the ground of experience. This is all to the good, but he does not leave much history behind the experience.

This book is an able and thorough piece of work. It is too rationalistic to present a true picture of the Christ of faith. But every one who worships Jesus as this writer does will paint his picture of Him. And perhaps they are all needed to help us to the final truth.

PROFESSOR McFADYEN ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The well-known Professor of Old Testament Studies in Glasgow United Free Church College has followed up his admirable 'Approach to the Old Testament' with another equally admirable and even more valuable: *A Guide to the Understanding of the Old Testament*, by John Edgar McFadyen, D.D. (James Clarke; 5s. net). This book is based on articles which were contributed to a church magazine in Scotland, and which were designed to give the plain man an understanding of the principles and results of the Higher Criticism as this has been applied to the Old Testament literature. No one could do this better than Dr. McFadyen, and in point of fact the articles were so good that many of their original readers must have clamoured for their appearance in a permanent form. Dr. McFadyen is so conscientious a scholar that he puts his best into everything he does. And no one could wish for a better statement of what criticism makes of the Old Testament than he will get here. It is fair, candid, thorough, cautious. We do not know any book which in brief compass contains so much that is enlightening and satisfying. It is satisfying because with all his modernity Dr. McFadyen is a loyal and convinced believer, and he takes occasion not only to criticize but to appreciate, and to point out the real basis on which he, with other believing critics, receives the Bible as the Word of God.

There is indeed a great deal more in this book than has been indicated. The first section contains chapters which deal with the Bible generally, expounding its beauty, its variety, its uniqueness, with an enthusiasm which is catching. And the volume concludes with a section in which the religious worth of the Bible is illustrated in a series of delightful studies of Amos, Jeremiah, and the Psalms, with some others.

It is a real pleasure to be able to praise so highly the work of a scholar who has done so much to help ministers, teachers, and other students to understand the greatness of the Bible. He has made the Old Testament a new book to many, and he has done so because he loves it, and because he combines with a great scholar's adequacy a wonderful gift of lucid and simple exposition.

RICHARD BAXTER.

Dr. F. J. Powicke has completed his learned and scholarly biography of Baxter. The first volume, *A Life of the Reverend Richard Baxter*, left off at his marriage to Margaret Charlton, 'who bravely stepped out with him into the dark days which she knew were coming.' The second volume is entitled *The Reverend Richard Baxter under the Cross* (1662–1691) (Cape; 15s. net), and records how he suffered and behaved under the cross of being ejected and silenced—silenced by the Church he loved so well. A secondary aim of the volume is to show how much he owed to Margaret Charlton in the nineteen years they were together. The work is the fruit of industrious research, and is carefully documented; and it offers new material, furnished mostly by the Baxter MSS., for the completion of the picture drawn by Calamy, Orme, and later writers.

In Dr. Powicke's sympathetic study the point is clearly made that Baxter was no hard-shell scripturalist and puritan. He was a 'Meer Nonconformist'—that is, as little of a Nonconformist as he could be. As such he is to be recognized as a prophet of moderation, seeking to hold the balance between the Prelatist on the one hand and the Separatist on the other, and clinging to the hope of a united Protestant England, of one English Church broad-based on simple Christianity.

In the interesting chapter entitled 'Baxterianism,' Dr. Powicke readily finds, as one might expect of an author who gave us last year an informing study of the Cambridge Platonists, a pronounced affinity between Baxter and writers like Whichcote and John Smith in the matter of their attitude to natural theology: 'he looked at the heavens not merely through the words of the 19th Psalm, but with the very heart of the Psalmist.'

The concluding chapter offers an appreciation of Baxter. 'Overdoing is undoing' was a maxim often on his lips, but he should have laid it to his own heart. Yet his 'overdoing' was but an error of judgment, springing from excessive anxiety to make out his case. Over against this and his explosiveness of temper must be set his single-mindedness, his moral elevation, and his spirit of love.

SIR OLIVER LODGE'S MESSAGE.

A new Trust has been created, called the Halley Stewart Trust, from the name of its founder and endower. The object is quite wide enough to include all efforts towards the amelioration of the species. Sir Oliver Lodge is the first person entrusted with the carrying out of its objects, and the course of lectures which he delivered in London in fulfilment of his commission has just been published under the title *Science and Human*

Progress (Allen & Unwin ; 4s. 6d. net). The lectures excited very keen interest when they were given, and we do not wonder. They are literally fascinating. This will be understood when it is said that they include much information on scientific subjects of an engrossing nature, reflections on the relation of science and religion, and on the bearing of science upon social problems, and finally a good deal of careful discussion of the destiny of the soul after death.

It would be impossible to refer in detail to the large number of topics thus embraced. But on the religious question Sir Oliver's statements are so remarkable that one or two may be quoted. 'If any one is able to contemplate the Universe in all its magnificence and interlocked beauty and variety, and come to the conclusion that nothing higher than mankind exists in it, I cannot envy him his common sense. The Universe is shoutingly full of design, plan, intention, purpose, reason, and what has been called Logos. Not only the heavens, but the earth ; not only the flowers, mountains, sunsets, but every pebble, every grain of dust, the beautiful structure of every atom, proclaim the glory of the Being Who planned and understands it all.'

With regard to miracle, take this : 'In particular, and as an example of what I mean, if I trespass off my ground and on to the ground of the Theologians, I want to say that, as far as I can judge, the progress of science is tending towards a strengthening of Theology in all its really vital aspects ; and that certain narrations which have been doubted—I shall be understood by many here if I cite as examples the direct voice at the Baptism, the Presences at the Transfiguration, the Vision on the road to Damascus—were true happenings. True, that is, not merely because of historical evidence, about which many are better judges than I, but because things like these *can* happen. And I look to the time when the constant interaction of spirit and matter will be more fully recognized ; when the term "spirit" will be extended to human spirit, and the Incarnation can be rationally recognized as both a Divine and a human fact.'

These are remarkable utterances from such a source. They will whet the appetite of readers for more. And we can safely promise these readers that they will not be disappointed.

SENNACHERIB'S INVASION OF PALESTINE.

A thoroughly valuable and necessary piece of work in connexion with *Sennacherib's Invasion of Palestine* has been done by Mr. Leo L. Honor, Ph.D., in a book bearing this title and published by Mr. Milford (Oxford University Press ; 9s. net). He points out that much that has hitherto passed for history is really hypothesis, and he gives seven hypothetical reconstructions of the invasion, or invasions, of Sennacherib ; for that is one of the problems—was there one or two ? The value of Dr. Honor's discussion is that he presents all the available ancient evidence, both from Assyrian and Biblical sources (Kings, Chronicles, and Isaiah) and discusses it in a thoroughly objective and impartial spirit. Much of it is notoriously difficult to correlate, *e.g.* the pro-Assyrian and the anti-Assyrian prophecies of Isaiah, and it is a great advantage to have this calm, dispassionate conspectus of the facts. Most people like definite results ; the value of this book is that it reveals all too plainly the impossibility in many cases of reaching final conclusions on the basis of the evidence at our disposal, and the sheer folly of dogmatism. Of the seven hypotheses mentioned above, Dr. Honor assures us that no one is better substantiated by the available facts than any other, and that all our conclusions must remain hypothetical until some new evidence comes to light.

THE EXTRA-CANONICAL NEW TESTAMENT.

Some of the early Christian literature, now excluded from the New Testament, has been gathered together, and is published under the dubious title *Excluded Books of the New Testament*, with an Introduction by Dr. J. Armitage Robinson (Nash & Grayson ; 7s. 6d. net). The title suggests, as Dr. Robinson says, that the books here issued were at one time regarded as part of the New Testament and were afterwards ejected on various grounds by a council of divines, which finally settled the Canon. This is, of course, not the case. The Canon 'growed,' like Topsy, and was selected by the faith and experience of the believers. And the books included in this volume excluded themselves. No one did it for them. All the same, it would be difficult to suggest a better title. Try it. Our own title is not very pretty.

Nevertheless, the books are immensely interesting and valuable from different points of view. They fall into two groups. First there are the Apocryphal books in the modern sense, 'The Book of James,' 'The Gospel of Nicodemus,' 'The Gospel of Peter,' and 'The Revelation of Peter'—all very revealing as to the state of mind of the early Church when

its members were cut off from heathen poetry and heathen enjoyments and found compensation in marvellous stories of Jesus and His apostles. Then there is a group of writings of strictly historical value, the Epistle of Clement, the so-called 'Second Epistle of Clement,' which is a homily of anonymous authorship, a passionate treatise called 'The Epistle of Barnabas,' also in reality anonymous, and the famous 'Shepherd of Hermas,' an early book of parables and visions that reveals much of the social side of Christian society in Rome.

These books are prefaced by an extraordinarily interesting introduction by Dr. Robinson which contains *multum in parvo* and is entirely sufficient for its purpose. The Translations are by Bishop Lightfoot, Dr. M. R. James, the Provost of Eton, and Dr. H. B. Swete. We must spare a word of praise for the beautiful dress given to this publication. The printing and the binding are unusually fine.

THE NEW PRAYER BOOK.

The Bishop of Gloucester, Dr. A. C. Headlam, has followed up his great 'charge,' which was recently published under the title of 'The Church of England,' by a very timely charge delivered to the clergy and churchwardens of the diocese on *The New Prayer Book* (Murray; 2s. 6d. net). The Prayer Book which has been in use hitherto is to all intents and purposes nearly 400 years old. That seems to many people a sound reason why it should be left alone. But the Bishop devotes himself to showing good reason for some change. As a matter of fact hardly any one uses the Prayer Book just as it is, and this introduces his first reason, that the Prayer Book should conform to existing usage. The second is that certain things in the Prayer Book which do not harmonize with the habits and thoughts of the day should be modified. Thirdly, we want to enrich the Prayer Book. Fourthly, many people demand that the Prayer Book should be adapted to the conditions of modern thought. Fifthly, there is a desire for more colour or ceremonial in the services. Sixthly, a Prayer Book should be such that the law of the Church would be enforced. These reasons are expounded with ample illustration and in a careful and considerate manner which is calculated to modify acid tempers. The changes are then gone over in detail, and an appeal is made for honest and candid consideration. We can hardly imagine any treatment of this intensely controversial subject more likely to produce an attitude of reasonableness. Dr. Headlam is known to be not only a scholar of great eminence, but a man of rare balance and moderation. These are notable qualities in a bishop and are just the qualities that are likely to make such an appeal as his successful.

We cannot have too many books of apologetic if they are good. And to be good they must be alive to modern needs and modern ways of thinking; they must be candid; they must be written with the pen of experience. *What may I Believe?* is the challenging title of a book of this kind, by Edmund D. Soper, and published by the Abingdon Press in New York ($1.50). No one can read this excellent series of discussions without being impressed by the author's sincerity, his knowledge of the doubting mind and of the points at which perplexity presses, and his firm grasp of essential truth. In our opinion, he gives away a little too much, *e.g.*, in discussing the value of the 'proofs' for the existence of God. But that only increases our confidence in his honesty. The questions he deals with include all that a young man at the doubting stage would ask. How may I know there is a God? Is the Bible God's Word? What is a miracle, and do miracles happen? How much more than a man was Jesus Christ? Is man the master of his fate? What becomes of a man when he dies? Why do men pray? Is Christianity the final religion? These are only examples out of the twenty-five titles. And it may safely be said that any one who puts himself in the hands of this guide will receive help of the most vital nature. This is a book that deserves warm commendation.

The title of a collection of sermons by the Rev. Charles E. Schofield shows the author's purpose and sounds the note which runs through all the sermons. It is *The Gospel of Opportunity* (Abingdon Press; $1.25). In an age of pessimism Mr. Schofield presents afresh the Gospel of Jesus with its undreamed-of possibilities of transforming the whole of human life. This central idea is perhaps most clearly worked out in a sermon on the Expanding Life, the gist of which may be read in 'The Christian Year.'

All that Professor Bosanquet wrote for the Press is worth not only reading but preservation. It is, therefore, not only a pious but a meritorious service which his representatives have performed in collecting his fugitive papers, *Science and Philosophy, and*

Other Essays, by the late Bernard Bosanquet (Allen & Unwin; 16s. net). The papers, twenty-four in number, are roughly classified under the headings Logic and Metaphysics; Ethical, Social, and Political; and Æsthetics. Every individual essay is of value, full of suggestion and stimulus, and all with a distinctive literary grace and finish.

Mr. Bertram Colgrave, Lecturer in English in the University of Durham, has given us a scholarly edition of *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid by Eddius Stephanus* (Cambridge University Press; 12s. 6d. net), a work which, with the exception of the Anonymous Life of St.Cuthbert, and Bede's Metrical Life of the same saint, is the earliest piece of biography in our literature. Written probably between 710 and 720 A.D., it offers a contemporary picture, if undoubtedly idealized, and bedecked with a spurious garland of miracle, of a man who was a great figure in the political and ecclesiastical life of England in the seventh century.

Mr. Colgrave rightly claims that there is a real need for a fresh text of Eddius. This he has supplied, with careful notes of the most important variants in the two extant manuscripts of the Life. He has also supplied an 'unpretentious' but accurate and readable translation of the Latin text, and helpful explanatory notes on the various chapters. It is a pleasure to handle a work so scholarly, and we hope that Mr. Colgrave will follow it up with that separate study of St. Wilfrid's life and character which he has in view. It would be useful and interesting to set, if possible, the picture drawn by Eddius against its true historical background.

Professor Watt, of New College, Edinburgh, with some reluctance undertook to exhibit the particular problems which have faced the Church in each of her twenty centuries, by writing an account of a Churchman representative of each. His reluctance is understandable, for it is an almost bizarre task. History does not recognize the division of her own course into centuries, however useful the convention be for us. The task of selecting just one individual as representative of the manifold developments of centuries like the eighteenth or nineteenth is obviously one which no two human beings would be likely to solve in the same way.

Apart from the conception of the book, for which the author is not responsible, the workmanship deserves the highest praise. As a brief but 'meaty' account of nineteen men, all noteworthy figures in Church history, we have seen nothing so admirable. There was no room allowed for footnotes or references, but the statements represent the considered judgment of a scholar whose knowledge is full, and whose historical insight may be thoroughly trusted. The book is entitled *Representative Churchmen of Twenty Centuries*, by Professor Hugh Watt, D.D. (James Clarke; 6s. net); and the men selected are Paul, Justin Martyr, Cyprian, Constantine, Augustine, Columbanus, Gregory, Boniface, Charlemagne, Odo of Cluny, Hildebrand, Bernard of Clairvaux, Francis of Assisi, Wyclif, Gerson, Luther, Henderson, Wesley, and Livingstone.

The Statesmanship of Jesus, by the Rev. W. P. Goard, F.R.G.S. (The Covenant Publishing Co.; 3s. 6d. net), is declared in the subtitle to be 'A Study in the Wonderful Epistle to the Hebrews.' It cannot with any degree of accuracy be so designated. The exposition certainly follows the course of the Epistle, but little attempt is made at patient study and faithful interpretation. On the contrary, the writer's own peculiar views are thrust upon the text, and in particular it is tortured to bear testimony to the strange doctrines of British-Israelism.

The insular complacency of John Bull is a plant of renown, but the climatic conditions since the War have not been altogether favourable to its growth. We are learning, slowly and painfully perhaps, that we differ from other nations as much as they differ from us, that our standards of judgment are relative, and that other races may have not only different viewpoints, but even different mentalities. These lessons are strikingly illustrated and enforced in *China and Britain*, by Mr. R. O. Hall (Edinburgh House Press; 2s. net). The appearance of this book is timely and it ought to be read by everybody who is interested in China. It is written with conspicuous impartiality, with full appreciation of the difficulties which beset the relations of Britain and China, and with a deep desire to promote international brotherhood.

Mr. Robert Brymer vouches for the truth of the twelve stories which he tells in *Uncut Jewels* (Harrap; 3s. 6d. net). They are of lads who have come under his own personal care while he was engaged in mission work. Perhaps the strangest of all is 'Jim.' He was a thief, and after being saved from prison time after time by his friends, is at last left undergoing detention under a kind of modified Borstal system. Here is an extract from Jim's last letter: 'It's a long time

ago since I wrote to you or you to me. No doubt, now, you think I am not worth the trouble. Life here leaves a lot to be desired, as you can imagine. At present the ground is quite six inches in mud. This fact alone tends to make not only my temper rotten, but many others'.

'You have interested yourself in the class of boy that is here, namely, the poor-law class, and have found good in them. After nine months' residence here I cannot find one redeeming feature about them. It's the greatest eye-opener in the world to stop at a place like this. In my opinion there is a far more deserving class of people need help. To keep these people, who breed like wild animals, is sheer waste of taxpayers' money.

'I captain our football team, and I'm looking forward to the summer, when cricket arrives. Give my kind regards to all at the Brotherhood who were acquainted with me, also to Mrs. Brown. I should like to hear from you soon.' Mr. Brymer's comment is, 'Here faith and prayer have been sorely tried.'

A Book of Modern Prayers: A Collection of Prayers and Readings by Modern Writers, with an Introductory Essay on the Meaning and Value of Prayer, has been prepared by the Rev. Samuel McComb, D.D., and published by Messrs. Longmans (6s. net). The editor has not been content with well-known and easily accessible prayers. He has ranged widely from Cardinal Newman to Henry Ward Beecher, from Robert Louis Stevenson to Benjamin Jowett and George Matheson. The volume contains about sixty prayers, which are arranged under broad subject headings.

The Life of Thomas Cranmer, by Canon Anthony C. Deane, M.A., F.R.S.L. (6s. net), is the first of the 'Great English Churchmen' Series, edited by Mr. Sidney Dark of the 'Church Times,' and published by Messrs. Macmillan. The series, which is intended to show the significance of the man in the age in which he lived, makes a most excellent beginning. Canon Deane has succeeded in writing an attractive book. It is on popular lines, and the style is as popular as it is pointed. His estimate of Archbishop Cranmer seems to us to be very just; and the setting of time and place is portrayed with admirable clarity. Particularly successful is the description of the relations between the greedy and immoral despot and his credulous, pliant, and subservient tool. We are told that the general editorial policy is to select a biographer sympathetic with the character with whom he deals. In the study before us Canon Deane certainly shows understanding of Cranmer's mind and temperament, but that does not prevent him from dealing faithfully with Cranmer. He would 'mingle pity for the timid servant of a tyrant king with unfaltering censure of an Archbishop who betrayed his Church.' 'Few good men,' he adds, 'have done so many bad things.' Undoubtedly it would have taken a man of courage, conviction, and resolution to lead the English Church in the days of Henry VIII., and Cranmer was not such a man. His lamentable failure in leadership may only be excused on the ground that he was transferred against his will from Cambridge to Lambeth; and it was only redeemed in the last act of his unhappy career when he thrust his right hand into the rising flame, crying, 'This hand hath offended!' Yet after all, Cranmer was a great Churchman. He first secured for the English people the right to own and study the Bible in the English tongue, and he gave the Church of England her Prayer Book, which work is his best memorial.

The second volume in the series is *John Wesley,* by the Rev. W. H. Hutton, D.D. (Macmillan; 6s. net). This is a volume which is equally fitted to inform the general reader and to charm the scholar. It is eminently readable, and without being overburdened with detail it gives a sufficient outline of the great preacher's life and work. But perhaps it is most admirable in the judicious, fair, and charitable estimate it gives of Wesley's character, and in the artistic skill with which it makes his noble figure stand out clear against the background of his own times.

Was Jesus an Historical Person? by the Rev. Elwood Worcester, D.D. (Milford; 6s. net), embodies the substance of two lectures delivered in Emmanuel Church, Boston. The first surveys the evidence of early heathen writers, and there is a particularly full discussion of the references to Jesus in the various texts of Josephus. The second lecture deals with the evidence of early Christian writers, and here the most notable point is a thoroughgoing defence of the Gospel miracles in the light of modern therapeutics. On this subject Dr. Worcester, as is well known, speaks with an uncommon degree of authority, and his book, though all too brief, is a weighty contribution to the matters of which it treats.

Under the Shadow, by Rev. G. H. Lunn, M.A. (Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net), contains a series of twenty-six short meditations which first appeared

in 'The Christian' during the year 1926. 'They were written with the very definite purpose of providing short, simple forms of worship for the "shut-in" Christians who, through illness or infirmity, were "shut out" from the ordinary means of grace. They were written, too, with the earnest desire that they might in some small way breathe a message of hope to the downcast, cheer to the depressed, comfort to the lonely, and salvation to all.' We need not commend them further than to say that they are eminently fitted, in their wisdom and tenderness, to fulfil this ministry of love.

Pioneering in Northern Rhodesia, by Mrs. E. M. Jakeman (Morgan & Scott; 2s. net), is a simple narrative of three years' work at Luampa, a recently opened station of the South Africa General Mission. It is doubtless intended mainly to inform and interest the friends and supporters of the Mission, but it is fitted to warm the hearts of all Christian readers.

Sir Arthur Conan Doyle is, as everybody knows, an ardent spiritualist. He is as ardent a missionary of his convictions on the point, and the latest proof of this is *Pheneas Speaks:* Direct Spirit Communications in the Family Circle, reported by Arthur Conan Doyle, M.D., LL.D. (The Psychic Press and Bookshop; 3s. 6d. net). Pheneas is a spirit in the other world, and a great friend of the Doyle Circle. If we could accept these communications at their face value, they would settle the matter for good. They ought, at any rate, to be carefully considered by the public; and no doubt will be. They are part of the 'evidence in the case.' And so far as these conversations are concerned, it all seems almost too easy. There seems little difficulty in 'getting it over.' The talk is as free and as detailed as at a tea-table or the fireside. They are fortunate people indeed who can so easily and so frankly and fully converse with the people on the other side.

'British Preachers, 1925,' and 'British Preachers, 1926,' were so successful that the publishers, Messrs. Putnam's, and the Editor, Sir James Marchant, K.B.E., LL.D., have been encouraged to publish *British Preachers, 1927* (6s. net), and there is every likelihood that we may look forward to an annual volume in future. The choice of representative preachers—a very excellent one—has been made by the editor, with the assistance of the Lord Bishop of Winchester, Principal Garvie, and Dr. James Black. Among the preachers are the Archbishop of York, Very Rev. Charles L. Warr, M.A., Right Rev. Frederic L. Deane, D.D., Rev. J. Harry Miller, D.D., and the Rev. Professor George Jackson, D.D. But if we are to make an inner circle we would place in it the Rev. Thomas Yates with 'The Raised Values,' the Rev. Hubert L. Simpson, M.A., with 'The Revealing Rent,' and the Rev. C. W. Gordon, D.D. (Ralph Connor), with 'God's Eternal Quest.' Mr. Simpson's sermon will be found, in abridged form, in 'The Christian Year.'

Winifred Kiek, Minister of Colonel Light Gardens Congregational Church at Adelaide, delivered a series of lectures at Parkin College. The gist of these has now been published by the R.T.S., with the title *Child Nature and Child Nurture* (3s. 6d. net). It is a thoroughly up-to-date but well-balanced study of the different factors in child development. It is unfortunate that space has made it necessary to leave out many illustrations and the practical application of principles. What we have whets our appetite for more. Turning to the chapter on 'The Child and Sex,' the first thing we are told is that the policy of silence must be broken. As the author shrewdly says, 'All knew that the child would somehow find out elsewhere. Indeed they depended on his finding out elsewhere.' But in what way is information to be given? 'Very many good authorities advocate leading up to the question from a study of plant life, and this would seem very natural and easy. Of course, it would be really suitable in a case where a child was doing a course of botany or nature-study, but it would be a more or less artificial method with a child who was not accustomed to study plant life. He would be surprised at the strange lesson, and the very novelty of the subject would stir in his mind just those suspicions of a special and abnormal experience which we want to avoid. Whether this course is adopted or not we should remember, I think, that formal instruction is not what is desired. To give a detailed comparison or a long explanation is to rob the opportunity of its promise. It were better to devote one's attention to the flower until the process is fully understood, and then suggest that life in general is the result of the feeding of one seed with another. To my mind, this, good though it is, is incomplete without some references to the great and wonderful Power Who makes these things possible.'

In *Far Above Rubies* (R.T.S.; 5s. net), Mrs. Agnes Sligh Turnbull has done a daring thing. She has

taken a number of Bible stories and has not only filled in the background but has invented fresh incident. So the Bride of Cana is one Elisabeth, 'a bride with white in her hair.' She has been betrothed for many years, but the marriage has been postponed again and again because she is still needed in her own home. There will be diversity of opinion as to the wisdom of this. But if it is to be done it could not be done with more delicate fancy or in a more reverent spirit than here.

Palestine Awake, by Sophie Irene Loeb (Sampson Low; 7s. 6d. net), is the story of 'the rebirth of a nation.' The fascinating narrative of the colonization of Palestine by Jewish pioneers is told with great vividness and enthusiasm. It is an amazing record of an ancient land being visibly transformed day by day. Even America would find it hard to equal the growth of Tel Aviv, the wonder city of Zionism, which has sprung up near Jaffa, almost with the rapidity of Jonah's gourd. Said the Mayor, with a proud smile, 'During the last four years, when anybody asked me the population of the city, I would answer, "This morning the population of Tel Aviv is so many thousand," because by the afternoon or the next morning there would be a hundred or two more.' Lovers of Biblical Palestine will read the story with mingled feelings, and may wonder whether the new Jerusalem with its cinemas and jazz bands, its beauty parlours and cabarets, is any improvement on the old. But it cannot be doubted that here in the ancient Holy Land we are witnessing one of the significant movements of history, and one which deserves to be closely studied.

It must be an extraordinarily difficult thing to write a short manual on Christian doctrine, covering the whole field and preserving a due proportion between the several parts. Yet the work, if well done, should be highly serviceable. In *Christian Foundations*, by Principal H. Maldwyn Hughes, D.D. (Sharp; 4s. net), we have a summary of the doctrines of the faith which it would be difficult to praise too highly. It is admirable in every way. It has been written 'at the request of the Connectional Local Preachers' Committee of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, for the use of local preachers and candidates for the ministry,' and certainly the local preachers who master this book will be well equipped for their work. It is not, of course, built on the same scale as the standard works on Systematic Theology, but it gives a bird's-eye view of the whole subject which will enable the student to see at a glance the lie of the land. If any preacher is minded to give a series of sermons on Christian doctrine—and there is a feeling abroad in the Church that the time has come for a revival of doctrinal preaching—he cannot do better than take this book for his guide.

We are getting almost too much of Psychoanalysis. Still, there is always room at the top! And Mr. A. E. Baker makes out a good case for his examination of this subject in *Psychoanalysis Explained and Criticised* (The Sheldon Press; 3s. 6d. net). His case is this. First, his book is simple—a sound reason. Secondly, his book is frankly critical, which few on the subject are. Thirdly, his book is decent, a notable fact also. And finally, it is cheap! Well, can you resist all these arguments? Not likely. And when you do spend your 3s. 6d. (net) you will really get good value. Mr. Baker is well informed, fully expository, and entirely sceptical of the value of Freud's work as a contribution to truth. He ventures to do what very few venture—he denies the very existence of the Unconscious! This is courage indeed, and what is worse (or better), he has his very persuasive reasons. But the same common sense and the same douche of cold reason are applied all round. Do not imagine this is a superficial and scornful rejection of the New Psychology. Its truth is granted, but its errors and its assumptions are ruthlessly analysed.

Our Great Heritage, by W. T. F. Jarrold (Simpkin, Marshall; 5s. net), is written in support of the British-Israel theory. It tells how the prophet Jeremiah fled from Egypt to Ireland, bringing with him a Jewish princess through whom the British royal house comes to be of the lineage of David, with many other tales of a like kind. The author's conception of historical evidence is extraordinary, and only to be matched by his impossible pictures of the future, when a restored Israel shall occupy all Arabia and build a mile-square temple in the centre.

The Apocalypse in the Light of To-day, by Rev. J. O. Bevan, M.A., F.S.A. (Skeffington; 4s. 6d. net), is a brief and popular exposition of the principal symbols and main ideas of the Apocalypse. The writer makes no claim to originality, but he shows a competent knowledge of modern commentaries on the book. His treatment is perhaps too slight to serve the purpose of the student, but it will give the general reader a very fair conception of the Apostle's thought, and may lead some to

'see visions and dream dreams,' without which no Christian can be 'what he was intended to be —a mystic and an idealist.'

The Rationality of Public Worship, by Rev. J. E. Roscoe (Skeffington; 2s. 6d. net), is described in the subtitle as 'a polemic,' but there is really little of the controversial spirit in it. The argument is not closely knit, but the writer has many pleasant things to say about the value of public worship from the intellectual, moral, and social points of view.

Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley has put us once more in his debt by his translation of, and commentary upon, the difficult but highly important *Tractate Shabbath* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net), which he has prefaced with a really illuminating introduction. To Christian sentiment much of the tractate seems wearisome in the extreme, and more intelligently than ever, in the light of this little volume, can we rejoice over the liberty from Rabbinic views of the Sabbath which was won for us by the emancipating words and acts of Jesus. Its painfully minute directions as to what is and what is not permitted on the Sabbath, and its unedifying subterfuges must not blind us to its real importance, both for the understanding of the New Testament and as illustrating folklore. Dr. Oesterley has brought out these and other points in a lucid and stimulating way.

The publication of *The Philosophy of Confucius*, by C. Y. Hsu (S.C.M.; 1s. 6d. net), is most opportune. Every attempt to interpret Chinese thought to Western minds is to be welcomed, and especially is it necessary to endeavour to see China through Chinese eyes. Mr. Hsu has given a brief but most helpful summary of the teaching of Confucius, in which among other things he reveals some remarkable points of contact between the best Chinese thought and the teaching of Jesus. His conclusion is that 'Confucius' idea of God is more or less similar to that of Christianity, and that Confucius, though he was not a religious founder, has paved the way for Christianity in China as Plato did in Greece. Thus the gulf between Confucian philosophy and Christian doctrine can easily be bridged, if both are understood thoroughly and interpreted properly.'

There are now seven volumes in the 'Modern Series of Missionary Biographies' which is being published by the Student Christian Movement. The latest addition is *George Grenfell, Pioneer in Congo*, by Mr. H. L. Hemmens, the Assistant Home Secretary of the Baptist Missionary Society. It in no way takes the place of the classic life by the Rev. G. Hawker, or of Sir Harry Johnston's volume on 'George Grenfell and the Congo.' But it has a place of its own, telling the story of Grenfell shortly but in an admirably fresh and interesting way. And it contains not a little new information. Perhaps the most interesting concerns that strange recluse of Leeds—Robert Arthington. He literally modelled his life on a missionary's words, 'Were I in England again, I would gladly live in one room, make the floor my bed, a box my chair, and another my table, rather than that the heathen should perish for lack of knowledge of Christ.' He was straitened so that the Missionary cause might not suffer, and it was his gift of £1000—offered in the famous letter of May 14th, 1877—that led to the opening up of Congo by the Baptist Missionary Society.

The Messiahship of Jesus.

II.

The Evidence of St. John (1).

By the Reverend J. O. F. Murray, D.D., Selwyn College, Cambridge.

In studying St. Mark we were in touch with the earliest stage in the transmission of the Gospel story. The sources of St. Mark date back to the time when the earliest converts in Jerusalem gathered round the Apostles to hear the story of the things that they had seen and heard in the course of their discipleship. Jesus, as they believed, had been raised from the dead to His throne at the right hand of God as Christ and Lord. His will was the law of their life, and guidance in the dis-

cernment of that will came most naturally through reminiscences of the things that He had said and done. There would have been no demand at first for 'a Life of Jesus,' nor could the Apostles at that time have any sense of their Subject as a whole.

St. Mark retains the spontaneity and freshness of this early period. Each narrative has a value of its own. It is not regarded as a subordinate part of a greater whole. No attempt is made to mark distinct stages in our Lord's ministry, or to define the process of His self-revelation. It is this quality more than any other that accounts for the high estimation in which St. Mark is held to-day as an historical document. The Evangelist is under no suspicion of having distorted the tradition that came to him.

St. John has to meet the needs of a later generation. Christians are no longer content to ask for light on the character and will of their Lord, or for 'scripture proofs' of the necessity of the Cross and the Resurrection. They have become conscious that He is in some sense both human and Divine. Speculation is busy with the problem of the inter-relation of these two elements in His personality. In view of the absolute chasm that separated God and Man in the popular conceptions alike of Jew and Greek, any solution seemed easier than the essential and permanent union of these two elements without the destruction or diminution of either in the unity of His Person. The First Epistle of St. John shows that an alternative theory had already been propounded. This may well, as early tradition asserts, have been the theory of Cerinthus. It draws a sharp distinction between the human Jesus and the Divine Christ who descended on Him at His Baptism and left Him on the Cross. It denied that Jesus could be personally identified with the Christ,[1] and refused to acknowledge the possibility of an incarnation of the Christ. The theological implications of this theory St. John expounds and denounces in his First Epistle. He sets himself in his Gospel to give historical grounds for the faith which was in him, and which was clearly the traditional, however dimly apprehended, Creed of the Church.

We cannot therefore ignore the fact that the Fourth Evangelist has a dogmatic interest in writing. He takes pains to force the fact on our attention. Whether he thereby destroys his credibility as an historian must depend ultimately on the truth or falsity of his creed. A man would have no need to wrest facts to support a true creed. And, if he believes that human flesh has been the vehicle of a manifestation of God, he is of all men least liable to substitute figments of his own imagination for the Divine fact, especially when he insists that the revelation of the Word of Life, which meant everything to him, had been tested by sight and sound and touch. For with St. John faith is no synonym for lazy credulity. He is alive to the necessity for supplying proofs for the Christian Creed. He calls special attention to the variety and the fullness of the evidence to which Jesus Himself appealed in claiming the allegiance of the Jews, at the same time that He laid bare the moral causes that led them to reject Him.

The object of this paper is to examine the account that St. John gives of the self-revelation of Jesus and to compare it with that which we saw in my last article to be implied in St. Mark. His object in writing simplifies our task, at least to this extent: we have no need to look under the surface for our material. The self-revelation of Jesus is the central subject of the whole Gospel. Our chief difficulty arises from the wealth of the material thus put at our disposal.

To keep our treatment of this material within limits we shall follow strictly the simple outline of the subject as it came before us in St. Mark. The key to the self-revelation of Jesus in St. Mark lay, as we saw, in the fact that Jesus came from His Baptism with a strong sense, on the one side, of His Divine Sonship, and on the other, of a mission to preach the gospel of the Kingdom of God. We saw that with a view to bringing in this Kingdom He gathered round Him a band of disciples from whom He claimed absolute devotion, and from whom He elicited a confession of His Messiahship.

If with this sketch in mind we pass to the consideration of St. John, we shall be struck by the fact that point after point that lay under the surface in St. Mark is brought into the clearest light by St. John. For instance, the witness of the Baptist to Jesus had to be inferred in St. Mark from our Lord's answer to the Jewish authorities at the end of His Ministry. It is the one point in the ministry of the Baptist which has an interest for St. John.

[1] To avoid confusion we must remember that the term 'Christ,' as we find it in Cerinthus and in the First Epistle of St. John, has a far richer content than it could have had in Palestine in the course of our Lord's ministry. The vague and confused anticipations, partly political, partly apocalyptic, that were connected with it then had for sixty years been acquiring clearness and power, at least in Christian circles, from the fact that it was as Christ that Jesus was ruling in their hearts, and was coming to judge the nations of the world.

The thought of 'Mission,' again, is found once[1] in Mk 9^{37}. It is implied in the Parable of the Vineyard and the Husbandmen (Mk 12^{6}, Mt 21^{37}, Lk 20^{13}). It is found in St. Luke in the text of His sermon at Nazareth, and again in 4^{42} (cf. Mk 1^{38}). But when we come to St. John the thought becomes dominant and all-pervading. It is found no less than forty times, coming in every chapter from the fourth to the seventeenth, and culminating in the words in which after the Resurrection Jesus sends His disciples to carry on the mission committed to Him.

Notice next the stress laid on the fact that the source of this mission is 'the Father.' We saw that the thought of the Fatherhood of God is present in St. Mark, most significantly in his account of the Agony in the Garden. But it is found hardly anywhere else. In St. John the Father appears again and again as the source of His mission. Jesus regards it as more important that men should recognize who sent Him than that they should discuss who He Himself might be, or what precisely was the work that He had been sent to do. It seems, indeed, as if faith that He had come forth from God takes the place in His training of the disciples that faith in His Messiahship holds in the Synoptists (Jn 16^{30} $17^{8.\ 21.\ 25}$).

The fact is that while we are anxiously scrutinizing every syllable to find out what He said and thought about Himself, His own interest is not there at all. He is doing all He can to fix our thoughts on the Father, His Father and ours. Of course, He called Himself, as the Father had called Him, 'Son.' Of course, as Son He had a special position to fill both towards God His Father and towards His brethren. And it was of vital importance that His brothers should understand that position, not only for their sake and His, but also for His Father's sake. But His first object is to be true in His own life to His Sonship, and so to reveal His Father to men, and bring them back to Him. He says no more than is necessary to help them to find the Father where alone He can be found by them, in the life of perfect obedience which He lived in human flesh in their sight.

The fundamental fact of His completely surrendered Will is revealed once for all by St. Mark in his record of our Lord's prayer in Gethsemane. And one significant utterance makes obedience to the Will of God the token of spiritual kinship with the Son. But in St. John the thought of the sovereignty of the Divine Will colours the whole life. 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work.' 'I seek not my own will, but the will of him that sent me.' 'I do always the things that are well pleasing in his sight.' 'The Son can do nothing but what he sees the Father doing.' 'The things which I speak I speak not of myself, but the Father abiding in me doeth his works.'

In the light of this fact it is less surprising that in speaking of the fact of His mission He seldom gives any hint as to the work He had been set to do. His work was to bring the wisdom and power and love of God into manifestation in the service of men in His Father's Name. By living as an obedient Son, doing His Father's works and speaking His Father's words, He so manifested His Father's Name to men that when He came to die He could say, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.'

In so fulfilling His commission—and there are indications from time to time that the fulfilment would involve the laying down of His life—He could claim from His brethren a like completeness of loyal surrender to Himself by virtue of the authority inherent in that commission, and so open the way for them to the Life of the New Age, on which He Himself had entered, and which He had come to bring within their reach.

The Gospel of St. John sketches for us the different stages by which, starting with this conception of His office and work, Jesus strove in the course of His ministry to bring His claim home to the hearts and consciences of men. Two strands were closely intertwined throughout the narrative. The one concerns the self-revelation and all that it implies for the New Birth of Humanity as shown to the little band of disciples. The other records the efforts which Jesus made again and again, first to win the allegiance of the people and their leaders, and then to open their eyes to the spiritual causes of their murderous reaction to His appeal. We must confine our attention in this paper to the second of these threads. It fills what we saw was an obvious gap in the Gospel according to St. Mark. It records the preparation that Jesus made for the final appeal to the High Priest and the Sanhedrin at His trial.

The scene throughout is Jerusalem. It began, St. John tells us, with the Cleansing of the Temple at the first Passover after the Baptism. By this act He laid public claim to the authority to which the witness of the Baptist entitled Him. His zeal is kindled for 'his Father's house' (2^{16}). The act itself was an act of righteous indignation. It was an appeal to the national conscience at head-

[1] Kindred sayings are found in Mt 10^{43}, Lk 9^{48} 10^{16}; cf. Jn 12^{45} 13^{20}.

quarters. It was a claim to be accepted as leader in a moral regeneration. The authority claimed was prophetic, rather than political. The High Priestly leaders refuse to submit to this authority, taking refuge under a demand for 'a sign.' The claim, however, is not to be enforced by any form of material or spiritual compulsion (cf. Mt 12^{18}, Is 42^{1-4}). The rejection, as Jesus foresaw, must be consummated on the Cross (2^{19}).

There seems no inherent improbability in the supposition that the Cleansing was repeated, when, at the end of the ministry, it was necessary once more to assert publicly in act the authority with which He had been invested. The difference between the words of the Lord on the two occasions is significant. On the first occasion the rulers are rebuked for making 'his Father's house a house of merchandise.' When their attitude towards Him is fully declared they are told that they are making the House of Prayer into a robbers' den. The authorities in the Temple were for the time allowed to go their own way.

The thought at the back of our Lord's answer is the same as that of the Parable of the Vineyard and the Husbandmen, and of His refusal on later occasions to satisfy similar demands from the Pharisees, as recorded by St. Matthew.

The same visit to Jerusalem was the occasion of an attempt to help an inquirer from among the Pharisees to understand the spiritual conditions which must be fulfilled by those who would understand our Lord's teaching or enter with Him into the New Order.

The conversation with Nicodemus fits the situation created by the work and witness of the Baptist. The reference to the Kingdom of God is in line with the account of the earliest preaching of Jesus in each of the Synoptists. The experience of Jesus at His Baptism—if that marked, as I have suggested, the moment of His own entrance into the Kingdom—illuminates His teaching with regard to the New Birth of 'Water and Spirit.' Even though the time had not yet come when He could Himself give to others the Baptism of the Spirit, He had Himself experienced it. And the Baptism of Repentance, which John was preaching, was of God's appointment for the whole nation. The Pharisees were defeating the counsel of God so far as they themselves were concerned by refusing to submit to it (Lk 7^{30}, Mt 21^{32}). Nicodemus and his friends would be vaguely conscious of the presence of a new power in the world. But they could not understand the laws of its operation until they had surrendered themselves to it. Jesus and the Baptist were testifying of what they had seen and heard. No further progress was possible until that testimony is accepted.

The healing of the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda raised a fresh issue. By this act Jesus challenged the religious leaders of the people to reconsider the fundamental principles of their teaching of the Law. Here, as in all the recorded cases of healing on the Sabbath, the violation of the Pharisaic rules of Sabbath observance was direct and deliberate. The cases were all chronic. None could be described as urgent. This impotent man had been ill thirty-eight years, and might easily have been kept waiting till sunset, and there was no obvious necessity for him to take his bed home at once. Jesus cannot have been unaware of the criticism that His action would arouse. In fact His attitude to the Sabbath antagonized the religious leaders from the start, and set them planning His destruction. It was as direct a challenge to the religious, as the cleansing of the Temple had been to the political, leaders of the people. It contradicted fundamental principles of their religious teaching, and called them to accept from Him a revolutionary vision of the righteousness of the Kingdom.

Jesus, when challenged to justify His act, does so expressly on the ground of His relation to God as Father. St. John records in 5^{19-47} an exposition of the principles on which His life as 'Son' is regulated; of the authority that belonged to Him; and of the witnesses to the truth of His claim which he would commend to their consideration. This defence, Dr. Westcott suggests, was given before the Sanhedrin. It is important to notice that the claim which is being expounded is Sonship, not Messiahship.

It will be worth while to examine this exposition in detail: 'My Father,' He says, 'worketh even until now, is at work at this present moment, and I work.' The point of this defence clearly is that, as Son, His life must be expected to reflect the life of His Father. And so His hearers understood Him. For, instead of raising the objection which we should have anticipated, that the commandment speaks of God as resting, they fasten on the pronoun 'my,' and the very practical application that Jesus was making of the relationship as revealing the law of His own life. He was making God His Father in a sense altogether strange and unprecedented. In spite of this commandment it had never occurred to them that their lives ought to reflect the life of God.

Our Lord, therefore, is able to leave on one side

the speculative question of the compatibility of rest and activity in the Divine life, and to re-state from various sides the claim that was exciting opposition. It is no doubt a wonderful claim, but, rightly understood, it is anything but self-assertive. It called men to realize, from what they saw, the power of God working through an utterly surrendered will. He had, no doubt, marvellous powers to exercise, and a position to fill of unique dignity and responsibility. All judgment was committed to Him. All men must honour the Son as they honour the Father. But He has not come in His own Name, seeking glory for Himself from men, but in His Father's Name. He does not even bear witness to Himself. He is content to leave the truth of His claim in His Father's keeping. But, for the sake of His hearers, He will remind them of the evidence already before them—the testimony of the Baptist; the testimony of the works that He was showing them from the Father, and the word of the Father Himself, acknowledging and commissioning His Son. But, alas! they were out of touch with the Father and so could not recognize His Son, or bring the testimony of their own Scriptures to fruition by enrolling themselves as disciples of Him of whom they spoke.

Such is the spirit of the whole defence. In the light of that spirit, utterly free from any taint of self-seeking, yet clear and resolute in its assertion of the position assigned to Him by His Father, and so sure of God that He can face without flinching the unbelief and even the murderous hate of the leaders of His people—we can venture to look a little more closely into the revelation that He gives us of the source and spring of all His Human activity. 'The Son,' He tells us,—it is the principle of all filial action,—'can do nothing strictly self-originated. He can only throw Himself into any work on which He sees that His Father is engaged.' Even so the range of possible activity that is open to Him is startling in its extent. 'For, whatsoever work the Father is engaged in, that the Son undertakes after His example.' It must of course seem strange to us that one in our flesh should have such insight into the counsel and working of God. Yet if the word 'beloved' heard at the Baptism corresponds, as we should expect, to a real fact in the relationship between the Father and the Son, is it not natural that there should be no secrets between them? And is not a work of healing, utterly beyond the power of uninspired human faculty, wrought in the Father's Name, a witness that the enabling insight is a reality, and has been given to the Son? Can we doubt that even more marvellous works are yet to come from the same source?

No record is given of any decision on the part of the Jewish authorities. It is clear that no condemnation could be secured on a charge of Sabbath-breaking. The determination to put Him to death (5^{18}), to which St. Mark also bears witness (3^{6}), persisted, and was matter of common knowledge at least in some circles in Jerusalem (7^{25}).

The Rest of the Future Life.

By the Reverend J. M. Shaw, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the United Church College, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

The thought of the future life as a life of rest is one that has appealed to men in all ages. It was a thought which appealed in particular to the early Christians, compassed about as they were in the early days of the Church's history with organized persecution and devastating horror and havoc.

I.

But this rest of the heavenly life has often been represented in a way which does less than justice to the Scripture representation. It is not a rest of ecstatic idleness or glorified inactivity—what Browning calls in his *Paracelsus*, 'the lone, sad, sunny idleness of heaven.' It is the rest rather of fuller and more harmonious activity. 'They rest from their labours,' says the voice from heaven which John heard in his vision, '*for* (not 'and' as in A.V.) their works follow with them' (Rev 14^{13}, R.V.). The striking collocation or juxtaposition of the words is to be noted. There is in the original a contrast between the two words 'labours' and 'works.' The word translated 'labours' (κοποι) carries with it a sense of weariness, of spentness,

of exhaustion. The 'labours' of the redeemed end in the grave; there the element of weary struggle and painful effort, it is suggested, is left behind for ever. 'They rest from their labours'—yes, from the laboriousness thereof, from the weariness thereof, but not from their 'works' (ἔργα), 'for their works follow with them'; in their habits, results, acquired capacities, their works remain and go with them into their new life for fuller development and achievement. In Milton's striking and noble words:

> Thy works, and alms, and all thy good endeavour,
> Stayed not behind, nor in the grave were trod;
> But, as Faith pointed with her golden rod,
> Followed thee up to joy and bliss for ever.

So much we may find already suggested by Jesus' own words. 'In my Father's house,' He said, describing the future life, 'are many mansions,' or, more literally and properly, 'many abodes' (Moffatt) or 'resting-places' (Jn 14^2). The translation 'mansions' of the Authorized Version suggests to us to-day stately and permanent or semi-permanent residences, but this hardly brings out the idea underlying the word in the original. Rather the idea is that of an abode in the sense of a resting or lodging place. For example: As Jesus passed through Jericho, we read, He saw a little man climbing up a tree to get a glimpse of Himself as He passed by. And Jesus said to him, 'Zacchæus, come down at once; to-day I must abide at thy house' (Lk 19^5). He asked for entertainment and lodging for the night. Or, in the story of the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, and the risen Jesus drawing near and going with them unknown, we read that as it drew towards evening they said to their unrecognized fellow-traveller, 'Abide with us, for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent' (Lk 24^{29}). It was an invitation not to a permanent residence but to a night's lodging—like a weary traveller lodging or resting for the night at a wayside inn and then continuing his journey on the morrow. Such is the significance of the word translated 'mansions' in our Lord's saying to His disciples in the Upper Room. 'In my Father's house there are many resting-places,' many lodging-places on the pilgrim's road to ever fuller perfection. Says Westcott, explaining the word used in the Greek, 'the contrasted notions of repose and progress are combined in Jesus' representation.' If rest, it is the rest or repose for the sake of fuller activity and progress, the rest of 'Going on and still to be.'

That is to say, growth or progress, it is suggested, is to be the law of life in the future as in the present. Growth there will be, we may be sure, first of all, in the knowledge and realization of fellowship with God the Father and with His Son, Jesus Christ, through an increasing realization of the purposes of Him who is the source of all truth, beauty, and goodness. Understanding Him more perfectly, and entering deeper into His purposes, we shall be enabled to render to Him more perfect obedience. And growing thus in knowledge of and fellowship with God the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ we shall grow in fellowship with and love to one another. And growing thus alike in love to God and to Christ and to our fellow-men, we shall grow too in power of service, each individual life finding new and fuller outlets for the expression of its talents and activities in a society of progressively redeemed spirits.

II.

So it would seem that we must revise and modify somewhat the traditional conception of the heavenly life as a life of ecstatic idleness or inactivity. We must substitute a dynamic or progressive for a static conception of the future life. The rest of the other world will be a rest not *from* work but a rest *in* work, the doing of work which it will be a joy to do, work in which the highest energies, which are checked and impeded here by the limitations of the physical body and of our mortal life, will find increasing scope and opportunity.

A paradise of inaction, a condition of stagnant bliss without progress or development, this would be to the human spirit an intolerable burden. In this life man's highest happiness lies in the worthy exercise of his intellectual and artistic and moral and spiritual energies. And surely the life of the future will not be a mere contrast to the best life of earth. Rather will it be, we may well expect, a heightening and transfiguring of the life of the present, a life in which man's whole nature springs into a new vividness of activity, and the energies and powers of this life set free from the hampering limitations and weaknesses of the body of flesh, and provided with what Paul calls a spiritual body—that is to say, a body fit to be the instrument of spirit under more spiritual conditions—shall win greater heights of achievement than were possible to us here. 'My Father worketh even until now,' said Jesus, 'and I work' (Jn 5^{17}). And if God and Christ are continually working, it would seem that those who would increasingly resemble them in spirit must participate in the same life of work and of activity.

What this work and what these activities of the future life will be, we can at present do little more than speculate. But our Lord Himself has encouraged us to believe, through His teaching, *e.g.* in such parables as those of the Talents and of the Pounds, that all faculties worthily employed here will receive additional and fuller scope in the life hereafter :

> We doubt not that for one so true
> There must be other nobler work to do
> Than when he fought at Waterloo.

So wrote Tennyson of the Duke of Wellington. And we recall how in his poem entitled 'Easter Day,' Browning's spirit kindles at the thought of the possible development in another life of such a soul and such talents as those of Michael Angelo, the sculptor :

> If such his soul's capacities,
> Even while he trod the earth,—think, now,
> What pomp in Buonarroti's brow,
> With its new palace-brain where dwells
> Superb the soul, unvexed by cells
> That crumbled with the transient clay !
> What visions will his right hand's sway
> Still turn to forms, as still they burst
> Upon him ?

Yes, 'his servants shall serve him' (Rev 22^{3}), there as well as here. God, we may be sure, will not take the tools from our hands just when we have begun to learn how to handle them. We shall carry with us into the future life not our character only, but also our capacities and powers, those capacities and powers which we have acquired or are acquiring through honest effort and service here. Into the heavenly Jerusalem the glory and honour not only of nations but of individuals shall be brought (Rev $21^{24.\ 26}$), for their fuller development and satisfaction. And if our different works or lines of activity here are, as Scripture teaches us, so many ways of learning and practising the life of service which is the great thing both here and hereafter, may we not suppose that no small part of the work of good and true men and women in the world to come will be the exercise of their several powers and capacities on behalf of those less advanced than themselves in the kingdoms of truth and of beauty and of love ? Will it not be the joy of the intellectually and artistically and morally and spiritually advanced to share their good things with the intellectually and artistically and morally and spiritually inferior ? So at least some of the early Christian Fathers thought. We find Origen of Alexandria, for example, representing the more perfect souls in the after-life as instructing the less perfect and thus helping them on nearer the Divine truth and goodness and love.

When, therefore, the life in heaven is represented, as it is in Scripture, and especially in the Book of Revelation, as a life of unceasing worship and unending adoration, this is not to be taken as implying that there will be no other activity than worship there. Rather it is, as it has been well expressed, that 'all occupations of every sort, being overtaken for the glory of God and in His service, will partake of the nature of worship.' 'We are mistaken,' said the late H. B. Swete, writing on this subject and drawing out the New Testament teaching, 'if we think of the life of heaven as worship only in our sense of the word. Worship, no doubt, it will be, *all of it,* because in that world all work will be worship, and every act, being brought into relation with God, will be a doing of His will, an offering of a free heart to Him, a priestly service acceptable to God through Jesus Christ our Lord' (*The Life of the World to Come*, p. 105).

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Such were Some of You ; but . . .[1]

'Such were some of you ; but . . .'—1 Co 6^{11}.

The other day I was reading about a bird—I have forgotten its name. But where people had always come upon it is away down in the south of South America. It is a sea bird. It nests on the cliffs where the spray is always dashing. It lives on fish. It spends its days, like the white gulls, poised upon the long, green, lazy swell of the huge billows. And then suddenly it's gone. Well, there is nothing much in that. Many birds migrate, of course. The swallows that built in your eaves

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

last summer have been spending the winter in South Africa. But where did this bird go? Nobody knew; and no one could find out. They searched, and they searched, but never a glimpse of it could they see. 'It must be somewhere!' they said. But no, they couldn't find it. It was worse than hide-the-thimble, when all the rest have seen it and sat down, and keep laughing at you who feel so hot and foolish left there all alone out on the floor, and yet you can't think where it is. But these people kept on searching, and at last they came upon that bird again. But no wonder they had taken a long while. When they saw it last it was away down in the south of South America. When they found it, it was far up in Alaska, in the north of the north. They were looking for a sea bird, and when they found it, it had become a land bird. They were searching for it on the beach; and they got it four thousand feet up in the mountains; they knew that it lived upon fish, and they discovered a bird that never thought of fish, but lived only on insects. It was a new creature, living a new life, in a new way.

That's a strange story, isn't it? But boys and girls can do that too. I've seen it. For a long time they are this, or that, and everybody knows it. And then somehow they become quite different; they, too, are new creatures, living a new life, in a new way.

You remember that fellow who turned up at school—a regular muff, wasn't he? He had been molly-coddled at home; he didn't play games; he couldn't do anything; he just hung about, and what a fuss he made about a shove or a tumble. But by and by you wouldn't have known him. He got keen, he threw himself into the thick of things. When he gets the ball at football now the other side have to look out; he is so daring, so apt to break through, and is so nippy with his passes. He's the same boy, yet could he be more different?

Sir Isaac Newton was like that. He was one of the cleverest men that ever lived. Yet as a boy, even a big boy, he was a bit of a baby. He was quite dull and always sat far down near the foot of his classes, never learned anything, and the masters said he was just hopeless. He never played boys' games, he didn't go with boys at all, but mooned about among the girls. And girls didn't play much then, as they do now—had a far poorer time of it. And Master Isaac spent his play-hours making chairs and tables for their dolls' houses—a dreadful kind of boy I think, don't you? But one day the bully of the school began to bully him, gave him an ugly kick. And that kick woke him up. Somehow he got up from the ground a quite different boy. The first thing he did was to take off his coat and thrash that bully.

That's what you always read about in the school stories. But it never happens in real life. Well, it did this time anyhow. And then he threw himself into everything. He became head boy of the school. And as for lessons, he could do them slap off as easy as looking at them, and was by miles the cleverest in every class. And fellows coming back to the old school used to stare at him. You don't tell me this is Isaac Newton who used to loaf about with the girls and play the baby! Well, I never! But he's become another fellow altogether. And he had.

There's something to cheer you up. For, perhaps, you too are rather dull. You try and try, but it's no use. However you keep trying, you are always near the foot, can't get the hang of it. Well, perhaps you'll wake up too, if you keep trying. And even if you don't, there are other things than lessons. Robert Louis Stevenson wasn't much use at his classes in his day. But tell me, who were the boys that got all the prizes and medals? Nobody knows, nobody cares. They're all forgotten. But we know about Stevenson. He did best after all. Don't you lose heart. There are other things besides French verbs and sums, and you may do them splendidly.

Or perhaps you are one of those little chaps who are afraid in the dark. You don't like to own it. But you know it's true. Out in the passage, creeping up the stair, your heart goes quick, and you can't keep from thinking there *is* something behind you. And you are vexed about it because other boys aren't like that at all, and yet you are. Ah, well! I remember once a fellow at the War who had crept out into the darkness of No Man's Land, and done wonderful things out there all alone, where every one felt creepy. And when I went to see him next day he laughed. 'It's a funny thing,' he said, 'this should happen to me. For as a boy I was dreadfully afraid of the dark, would make any excuse, would tell lies, I'm afraid, to get staying in the lit room just a wee bit longer. Well, it just shows that, if you stand up to it, you can beat anything.' He did; he became a new creature with new ways; and so can you.

So if you feel a horrid little chap in some ways; if you're ashamed about it; if, when you get into bed, you're dreadfully vexed you were so sulky and bad humoured and unkind; if you make up your mind you're done with that, and yet next day are just the same again, don't you give up! 'Such were some of you,' said Paul, after rolling

off a whole long list of hideous things—'such were some of you: but' not now. All that is left behind, and you're quite different. A sea bird that becomes a land bird; that eats fish, and that won't look at fish; that builds on the cliffs, and that leaves these for the mountains. Funny, isn't it? But that's nothing. For, grubby, crabbed, sulky, little beggar as you are, you can become, like Jesus Christ, as big and brave and wonderful as that! Really you can. What do you say? Let's have a try!

Off with his Head![1]

'The way of evil men, avoid it . . .'—Pr $4^{14.15}$.

Of course, you know well enough the crusty old Queen in *Alice* who was for ever ordering 'Heads off!' but the story was quite new to my lawn-mower. He listened without saying a word, as I read it to my little boy the other evening. The funny old Queen seemed a real heroine to my lawn-mower, and the next morning when I took him out of the tool shed, I heard him say, as soon as ever he began to travel over the lawn, 'Off with his head! off with his head!' He had caught sight of the dandelions and buttercups and daisies that will grow there. 'Off with his head!' he said, and sure enough those golden heads were soon off. My lawn-mower seemed thoroughly to enjoy his horrid work, and when I trundled him back into the shed again, he was purring loudly to himself, just as our dear old cat Ophelia does when we stroke her. I tell you he was pleased with himself. And he started the same game the next time, and kept it up the time after, until I had to say to myself, 'Why, the lawn-mower is splendid, he does not leave a single dandelion behind him.'

And then a wonderful thing began to happen. The dandelions and daisies although they had lost their heads had not lost their wits, for they had a 'confab' among themselves, right down under the grass, so that the lawn-mower could not hear them, and they decided that they had lost their heads because they had worn them on too long a neck, so they made up their minds to arrange for shorter necks and dodge the executioner! And they were as good as their word, for when next I brought out my lawn-mower, he was still in his old blood-thirsty mood—'Off with his head! off with his head!' he rattled as I rolled him up to the grass. But though the cutting blades were as sharp as ever, the mower went clean over the fresh dandelions, and I could almost hear them laugh at him as he looked back with surprise. The dandelions had beaten him! They had made their necks so short that it was impossible for the lawn-mower to touch them; and I had to go out after he had finished his work and dig them out with a knife, or I should soon have had my garden full. I can tell you my lawn-mower did not like the trick; at first he declared it was not his fault, he said the blades wanted sharpening, and he would like a drink of oil. But really it wasn't that. He had actually lost the power to cut off their heads, because they had been too clever for him. He still grumbles out, 'Off with his head! off with his head!' but he is almost as helpless as the poor old Queen, for the heads do not come off; and all his brave threats are in vain. Don't you think that was clever of my dandelions? I do. And let me tell you this, I made up my mind to try the same trick, because I know some people who always do me harm when I am with them. They say all sorts of unkind things, or they are always grumbling, or they ask me to do mean things, and I must confess that sometimes they have got me; but I am going to grow a shorter neck, I am going to keep my head out of danger's way. When they are about, I shan't be! and, I think, by 'lying low' I shall be as safe as the dandelions. Suppose you try this way too. I can see a half-dozen dandelions on my lawn that will give the method a hearty testimonial.

[1] By the Reverend Frank J. Gould, A.T.S., Watford.

The Christian Year.

Trinity Sunday.

A New Life.

'Let him come unto me.'—Jn 7^{37}.

No one, I think, who examines life to-day will deny the presence of two tendencies whose existence in life, especially when combined in the experience of a single individual, constitutes almost a strange paradox. The one, observable in the character and conduct of men and in that materialistic outlook which characterizes the view of not a few of our age, may perhaps be described as the spirit of self-sufficiency. The other, steadily becoming more apparent and making itself felt in spite of a superficial materialism, may be described as the recognition of some spiritual force ordering and controlling the affairs of men.

1. There is, first, *the spirit of self-sufficiency*. Never, I suppose, in the inculcation of ethical teaching, has the stress upon the power of character, the necessity for the exercise of the will, been more insistent or more widely expressed. A youth, for

example, starts upon life. What is the kind of advice that is tendered to him? Is it not something like this: 'You must train the faculties that you possess; you must mould the character which is yours; the spheres of life in which you move must reflect yourself; in you and in them lies the secret of success'?

Nor is it only in the advice that is proffered by the elder to the younger that this is to be seen. The methods of enterprise observable in every department of life, the machinery men employ, the spirit of toil, all attest it. Everywhere men who would succeed, who would mould the world to their wishes and to their will, look not so much to the passing circumstances, or to the opportunity of the moment—though they may seize it—but they look for the power of themselves to attain.

2. And yet side by side with the spirit of self-sufficiency there is *the recognition of some spiritual force ordering and controlling the affairs of men.* Science is more and more determining for us that the basis of things is ideal and spiritual. We have even novelists whose themes are not merely those of fiction or of history, but who are endeavouring to show that behind life lies some spiritual ideal. We have philosophic theories which have made the theory of materialism bankrupt.

Men may say to us that the only force which can conquer life and gain its possession lies within, that a man's attainment can only be measured by the degree in which he can impress his character upon the circle that surrounds him. But the fact remains that, affecting this method, revealing itself in unexpected ways, there are actions and principles of action which testify to the power of the unseen and the spiritual to aid them. It may give rise, as in some quarters of the world it does, to a strange and fanciful belief, or it may take a nobler form, as in much of the best speculative thought of to-day; but the point remains that it is a growing and increasingly influential power in the common affairs of human life.

3. There is one answer to the problem of *how these two tendencies* which are inherent in human nature *can be reconciled and utilized.* The Church, in spite of many a lapse, in spite of the overwhelming power of the world, which has sometimes distorted its outlook, has but one, and it is a unifying one. It takes the tendency to self-sufficiency, and shows where it may be ennobled. It takes the tendency to regard spiritual powers as a force in life, and shows what is their real basis. The Church whose foremost missionary could write such a splendid series of ethical instructions as is to be found in the twelfth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and could dictate such warnings as are to be found in the last chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, such a Church could never despise real culture. Nor, on the other hand, would she deprecate looking for the ideal and the spiritual. She comes to the man who has found something of these things and discovered their help and assistance, and she says to him: 'You have done well.' It is in these things that you will find strength. But you must go deeper. Behind spiritual aspiration lies some spiritual reality. Behind character lies creed. Behind all these things lies one great inspiring reality. What is it? It is that, surely, which the nature of man witnesses to, it is that which all our thoughts more or less are tending towards to-day—personality. And for us who own the sway of Christ it is the personality of Jesus of Nazareth—Man, but Son of God.

We face to-day, in the changing order of national and of social life, a noble duty and an entrancing task. What is that duty, and what is that task? It is the duty as never before, the obligation most important, of permeating the common affairs of life with the Christian spirit exemplified in Christian lives. But the noblest task by heaven decreed needs inspiration for its performance. There is no great movement in the history of the world but has started from some ideal. Some aim, some noble inspiration must lie behind it or it will fail. And behind all great movements there lies some great personality in which the ideal and the aim have become incarnate. Take an illustration.

It may well be that the conception of brotherhood and the development of social life were at the beginning of the movement for the emancipation of the slaves, but at the back of these things were great personalities—Abraham Lincoln and James Russell Lowell as the pact of its expression. For as Whittier set it down, so is it true of all movements in which ideas become incarnate in the lives of men:

> The letter fails, and systems fall,
> And every symbol wanes;
> . . . . .
> But warm, sweet, tender, even yet
> A present help is he;
> And faith has still its Olivet,
> And love its Galilee.

If, then, it be so—and all experience surely tells us that it is—is it not natural that when we are entrusted to-day with the tremendous task of reorganizing, re-creating, and re-uplifting in Chris-

tian principles the world about us, there should sound in our ears the warning that these things can only be done by men who have come unto the Christ? And was not the occasion of the words of our text significant? It was the Feast of Tabernacles. Two customs gave force to that significance. The one was the lighting of the great golden candelabra in the courts of the Temple, whose beams, we are told, shed light into the darkest corners of the city. The other was the drawing of water from the Pool of Siloam. The one spoke of the pillar of fire by night that guided in the desert, the other of the water that flowed from the rock. In that instant, when the thoughts of men were intent upon the wanderings of the past, and the stress and difficulty that had been, there sounded the voice of Christ, 'I am the light of the world,' 'If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink.' It told His hearers and His disciples that there might be all the wanderings of life, but they were not alone. There might be all the pressure of difficulty and of doubt, there might be longings for better things—then let them learn that the only power that can help them, the only inspiration which can uplift them, and the only abiding force which can ever be theirs lay in union with Himself; and that with Him as their power, and with Him as their inspiration, all the difficulties, and all the stress, and all the burden, and all the care, and all the hardship, and all the problems would be solved.

The answer, then, to the question with which we started lies in one word. It is Christ. In Him the spirit of self-sufficiency is transformed into that life in the image of which we pass from glory unto glory; in Him the gropings after something spiritual and ideal find their fulfilment. For in Him we can do all things. Is not this just the message that we need to-day? The cry, 'Back to Christ,' used in another connexion, becomes in our daily life insistent.[1]

First Sunday after Trinity.

Love.

'On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.'—Mt 22^{40}.

1. The instinct of the Pharisees was sound when they felt that our Lord's religious attitude was revolutionary even more in what He taught than in what He did, even more in His selection of the two commandments as the sum of the Law than in His consorting with publicans and sinners. For them the question with which they had so carefully approached Him was crucial. It was meant, no doubt, to test formally the real measure of His adhesion to the Law. And they felt that the application of the test had been justified. There was something wanting in this answer, the lack of which they had suspected all along. It was possible, under the pretence of adhesion to this pious formula, to depress the value of all those traditional observances and beliefs which guaranteed and defined the exclusive efficacy of the Law. There was nothing more dangerous than this loose identification of the Law with its least exclusive elements. Where would be the unalterable necessity of the Law as the sole means of salvation if it could be thus lightly resolved into a hazy something which might embrace the whole world of men in its appeal, and yet a something which no one dare claim that he was equal to honouring fully? It was somehow thus, no doubt, that the Pharisee reasoned. And if we attempt to follow the line of his reflection, we shall probably, if we are honest with ourselves, have less reason to be surprised than we think we have at the conclusion to which it led him. Can we honestly say that the same kind of declaration from a religious teacher whose orthodoxy was suspect among ourselves might not induce similar fears in us? And might we not point for a justification of our fears to the fact that Christianity proved indeed to be the solvent of the Law as a fixed and unalterable religious tradition?

2. Let us think what the attitude of the Pharisee was. He did not hesitate for a moment, he could not hesitate, to accept the truth and even the sufficiency of our Lord's answer. He admitted whole-heartedly, or at least he honestly thought he did, that the great commandments of the Law were to love God and to love one's neighbour. But he thought, too, that it was impossible to keep those commandments save through one special discipline. The most intelligent of Pharisaic theologians would indeed have insisted that the essential value of that discipline was that it enabled men to keep the great commandments. But they would have insisted, too, that without it it was impossible to keep them. And then the great majority were not intelligent. That strict observance of legal detail which the Pharisaic reform had introduced as an aid to the fuller love of God and love of the neighbour had become for the great majority of the later Pharisees an end in itself.

It is out of such a habit of mind that religion grows hard and formal, that it forgets its true nature and dies down into a lifeless routine. And yet the pity of it is that into the narrow, distorting

[1] G. Nickson, in *C.W.P.*, xciv. 219.

moulds of that routine of formal obedience there is often run an intensity of conviction and a fervour of loyalty which, if they had been free to find the channels of God's real action upon the world, might have co-operated there abundantly with the beneficence of His grace.

3. And at such times of obstinate religious hardness there is no hope of salvation but in a new and living word of God. Yet when such a word comes, it is only the old word reasserted in its sovereign might, restored to its natural and essential primacy. All the old words remain. It is only the accent that is shifted. Not one jot or tittle of the Law is necessarily abolished. We may still need every detail of the old religious observance, but we have learned why we need them. The end has become the end, the means has fallen back into its legitimate place as the means. And that has made all the difference. That slight shifting of the accent has effected a religious revolution. The Pharisee was quite right. One never knows what the end of such momentous change will be. Men naturally take it for granted that there is only one way of reaching the end they have in view which it is worth their while to take account of. That is an inevitable consequence of the law of spiritual economy which all life obeys. We do not waste our time considering ways and means which for ourselves do not exist. The way that avails for us is the only way that counts. And there is always the tendency to deny all efficacy to any other way even for others.

None the less, God speaks the new word again and again through the mouth of His chosen servants —the new word which is only the old word recovered from the custom which, instead of enforcing, had really deadened its appeal. God trusts the heart and the living will of man where the Pharisee will trust only a fixed and consecrated habit. It was such a new word that our Lord spoke in the flesh to the men of His own generation. It is such a word that He is speaking again to this generation through His Spirit. He is reminding us once more of the true end which all religious means are meant to subserve. He is pointing the heart of man to its goal in the life which adheres to God with all its power of will and purpose. He is taking us down into the common world to show us how we may be true to God there; He is revealing to us the will of God as the salvation of this actual world of ours; the power of God in every act and purpose which would heal the world's wrong; the life of God in the best that is feebly and fitfully labouring to assert itself in the life of man; the claims of God in the needs that clamour from human heart to human heart. He has given us, again, a world in which we can believe, for which we can labour with hope, which requires of us the spirit of love as its abiding need and our abiding satisfaction. He has, in short, renewed our religion, made it as wide as life, enlarged its boundaries to the farthest limits of spirit.

4. Well, it is just at such a time that we need the stern touch of discipline, the sincerity of a real preparation. We cannot afford to dispense with any means by which in the past our souls have been sustained in their high mission. We do not need so much to find new ways of training the soul as to use the old in all humility and simplicity of spirit. The desire to change the old instrumental discipline may be the very dissipation of our real spiritual energy. The straightforward recognition of its mere instrumentality, the sincere and steadfast purpose to use it as an instrument, will subdue and strengthen our wills to that end which God has so clearly defined for them in the satisfaction which they themselves demand—the love of God's righteousness and of our human fellows as fashioned by and destined for that righteousness. So alone is religion renewed from age to age by the reviving breath of God's spirit.[1]

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Revealing Rent.

'The king rent his clothes . . . and the people looked, and, behold, he had sackcloth within upon his flesh.'—2 K 6^{30}.

History furnishes few more graphic stories than that of the siege of Samaria. The plan of the invaders was not to carry the city in one or two assaults, but to camp about it and gradually starve out the garrison and the inhabitants. So great was the scarcity of food that an ass's head, which has but little flesh upon it, and that unsavoury, unwholesome, and for a Jew ceremonially unclean, was sold for some £5, and a small quantity of pulse or some such coarse corn, then called dove's dung, fetched about twelve or fifteen shillings a pint. It was when things had reached this extremity that the incident occurred whose gruesome details are recorded in the narrative. 'And it came to pass, when the king heard the words of the woman, that he rent his clothes; and the people looked, and behold, he had sackcloth within upon his flesh.' Like King James IV. of Scotland, with his iron belt, this Hebrew king had a hidden source of self-

[1] A. L. Lilley, *The Religion of Life*, 165.

imposed suffering. And in a sudden agony of grief for the wrongs and sufferings of his people the great man rent his royal robe, and through the purple rent the astonished people caught a glimpse of red and quivering flesh, teased and torn by the hidden garment of pain.

What strange and unutterable thoughts, what surging emotions, must have risen in the breasts of those who saw that sight! How the pain and the weariness and the wounds would be forgotten in the joy of communion and service with a king who stooped to share the sorrow of his subjects! The whole aspect of life, the call to defence, and the meaning of loyalty, stood out in a new light. The irksome siege took on a glory which it had not before; and the distasteful meal of ass's head became a very sacrament of valour.

The ramparts of Samaria are not more confining than the circumstances by which we all are walled about. And there are times when we grow impatient and disheartened in the endless siege and stress of life's opposing forces. And God seems to sit so unconcernedly and uninterestedly remote from, and so far above, the sphere of our sorrow. And then there comes that wonderful moment of revelation when, for the first time we look, really look, and see, through the rending of the seamless robe of God, the sackcloth within upon the heart of the Father.

To those who see it superficially, the death of Christ, the rending of the robe of His flesh, seems an evidence of weakness. There seems to such an one nothing in that sublime act which can help the desperate need of perishing men. But the people have looked and looked, and that rent which revealed the inner heart and nature of God has been the greatest evidence of power the world has ever seen. Where men thought there was but blind and unpitying might, they have beheld the sackcloth which veiled the sun, and have realized of the King of kings, according to those tremendous lines of Blake, that

> Till our grief is fled and gone,
> He doth sit by us and moan.

This glimpse of the hidden sackcloth has been the turning-point of many a life, taking it from among the weak and querulous and sending it forth to some post of valour on the wall. It would be futile to imagine that any single line of thought will ever enable us to enter into a full and satisfying explanation of the mystery of Calvary; and the fact that it has challenged the best human thought from its own day to ours without the last word being said by any about it, suggests that its glory is as many-sided as life itself. But there are many who have seen its significance most sublimely and compellingly as the rent through which the sackcloth appeared for one revealing and ever-to-be-remembered moment in the world's history. The mystic is here at one with the man of affairs. 'The Mystery of the Cross,' confesses Dora Greenwell, 'did not, it is true, explain any one of the enigmas connected with our mortal existence and destiny, but it linked itself in my spirit with them all. It was itself an enigma flung down by God alongside the sorrowful problem of human life, the confession of Omnipotence itself as to some stern reality of misery and wrong.' There are many devout and honest souls who cannot find any rest or comfort in the old penal and satisfaction theories of the Cross. This much we can say simply and truthfully, that, in His pouring out His soul unto death, Jesus was not displaying some new spirit, but the Eternal Spirit who is behind and in all history. The Cross was but the rending of the garments which the King had been wearing from the first hour when the hosts of evil had mustered about the city of Mansoul.

That rending of the veil on Calvary must ever remain something of a mystery. And yet its meaning grows plainer and profounder in proportion as we share the suffering, and shudder at the sin, of the world. It was to those upon the wall that the sight of the sackcloth on their king came home with such meaning. And it is those who have taken their stand upon the wall of defence, to preserve the moral and spiritual well-being of society, who can best appreciate the meaning of the display upon Calvary. Prior to any theological approach to the Cross must be the practical acceptance of it in all its implications. This was part of the secret of the wonderful way in which the sight of those wayside crucifixes in France gripped the imagination of the men who were fighting and suffering there. There can be no doctrine of the Atonement that is not mere words for him who has not somehow felt the rub of the sackcloth on his own flesh, who has not endured something of the shame and suffering of the Cross in his own little life.

They altogether mistake the Christian revelation who think of Jesus, as so many tend to do to-day, mainly as a healer or a teacher. Such an estimate, however sympathetically, reverently, and beautifully it may be presented, does no sort of justice to the historical interpretations of Jesus, which have all, with one accord, contemplated Jesus, first of all, as a doer rather than as a teacher, and

most of all in one supreme deed. It is not the Sermon on the Mount so much as the Sacrifice on the Hill that will save us to-day. We must build our tabernacles, not upon the Mount of Transfiguration, but upon the Mount of Disfiguration—where His visage was so marred more than any man. In these days, when things every bit as horrible as the boiling and devouring of their own sons by the women who bore them are happening in our world, we must have a tremendous gospel to meet a desperate need. Calvary means this, if it means anything, that the fight is so serious that the King Himself has had to come up on the wall, and has been wounded. If we need God badly, He needs us too. Do not let us stop at the ass's head, or the devouring of widows' sons, or even at our own wounds, or we will go mad. Behold for our salvation the sackcloth within upon the heart of our King. Let us come and behold it in the sacrament of the broken bread and the poured-forth wine, and behold the eternal love of God displayed at Calvary, that love that will not let us go until He has brought forth judgment to victory.[1]

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Expanding Life.

'I will make you to become fishers of men.'—Mk 1[17].

Jesus chose His first disciples from the fishermen of Galilee. There were no idlers among those whom He called to follow Him: Matthew from his custom-house, Simon and Andrew, James and John from their nets. They were all hard-working, busy men. In Jesus' invitation they recognized a higher call to wider fields of service—Jesus' coming to them marked an epoch in their lives. Their life with Jesus became an ever-expanding life—a life clarified by a vision of transformed values, vitalized by larger motives, broadened and deepened by wider horizons.

The words of our text are a symbol of the expansion of life wrought by their friendship with Jesus. Hitherto they had been fishermen. Had they never met Jesus, fishermen they would in all probability have remained. They sought no greater riches than they could bring to shore in their little fishing-smacks. The horizon of their lives was bounded by the margin of Galilee, the occasional visit to Jerusalem, and the gossip in the market-places of Greece and Rome and markets beyond the seas. They were contented that their life should be spent in catching fish.

[1] H. L. Simpson, in *British Preachers* (3rd series), 119.

And then one day Jesus came down to the Capernaum beach, and gave a new impulse to the lives of Simon and Andrew and James and John. Straightway their lives began to grow. New purposes were awakened within them. Their eyes caught visions of riches that were greater than any offered in the markets of Capernaum. The old horizons of life were pushed farther and farther back.

Our text suggests three ways in which the life with Christ becomes an expanding life.

1. When Simon became a disciple, Jesus began to transform his sense of values. Things which hitherto he had prized highly began to lose their worth in his esteem. And other things, to which he had hitherto given but little thought, became priceless. Hitherto he had been a fisherman. The chief values in his life had been the interests of his business.

You may judge a man somewhat by his conversation. What were the subjects most often discussed by these fishermen as they rested after their long night's labour, or exchanged greetings with friends in the market-place? The size of the season's catch of fish; the market price at Taricheæ; the stirring scenes at their last visit to Jerusalem; the latest gossip concerning Herod, and Pilate, and Roman Cæsar. Then came Jesus. And a new standard of values was held before them. 'I will make you to become fishers of men.' Those hated publicans who collected Roman taxes; the sinner and the outcast whom the austere Pharisees avoided like the plague; the despised Samaritan whose very neighbourhood brought defilement—those were the men for whom Jesus invited them to set their nets. The old topics of the market-place were gradually forgotten. And in their place we hear Simon at Pentecost preaching repentance and faith and the Kingdom of God, the joy and peace of forgiveness, and the indwelling of the Spirit of God. Old values were cast aside and new values became regnant in their lives since they were called 'to become fishers of men.'

Jesus has wrought a similar transformation in the values of human society. The challenge of the Master to the fishermen of Galilee to turn their attention from catching fish to catching men is a symbol of the expansion of life that Jesus has wrought. In the world to which He came human values were of little worth. The civilization of Rome was built on human slavery. Men were not citizens but subjects, the chattels of the emperor. The story of the progress of Christianity is the story of the rising worth of human values and the pro-

gressive subordination of material wealth. Slavery has been banished. The position of womanhood and childhood has been lifted from degradation and misery to honour and boundless opportunity. Property interests are becoming more and more subordinated to personal and community welfare. The Kingdom of Heaven is coming. The teaching of Jesus is transforming the ideals and the values of the world.

Every individual who becomes a disciple experiences the same transformation of values and ideals. The objects for which we were striving before lose all their glamour and become sordid and petty in the light of the new vision that He gives. 'I count all things to be lost for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord.' How trivial seems to us now the old ambition for personal profit and selfish gratification! For we have heard the voice of the Master calling us 'to become fishers of men.' We have had a vision of the riches of heaven, the incalculable spiritual blessings 'in the heavenly places in Christ.'

2. Jesus brought to Simon and his fellow-fishermen a larger and a nobler purpose. Hitherto the chief business of their life had been fishing. From henceforth they were engaged in bigger business. This did not mean that they were to forgo all gainful occupations. We cannot forget that for many years St. Paul supported himself and his missionary campaigns by the labour of his own hands. There were some in Thessalonica who were so carried away with the joy of their new-found faith that they ceased to work for a living and became a burden on their brethren. To these St. Paul wrote admonishing them to return to their tasks, and forbidding the Church to support any able-bodied men and women in idleness. The world still needed the labour of men's hands. But the task of making a livelihood was no longer the chief end and aim of their existence. The big business of these men's lives became, not the accumulation of wealth, but the building of the Kingdom of God.

This is still the message of Jesus to the world. He came to a world that was all absorbed in the struggle for bare physical existence, and for the piling up of wealth that could, by its very nature, prove nothing more than a mere transient possession. And His ringing message to men of every generation has been: 'Seek ye first his kingdom, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.' Jesus challenges us to turn our attention from the problem of making a living to that of making a life.

The life that is without Christ is still absorbed in the business of making a living. For how many of us has life little meaning other than a hard, back-breaking struggle for possession of a little hoard of material things. How much time do we spend in developing our mind, in fostering our capacity to appreciate and enjoy art and music and the things that enrich the higher life? And how much less time still do we spend in the cultivation of the spiritual life within, in deepening our faith, and in enlarging our capacity for communion with God?

When Jesus comes into our life, immediately the interests of the Kingdom of God become the major interests of life. The man who is in Christ will continue to farm, or to serve his community in the bank, or to build houses, just as he did before. And, if he is true to Jesus, he will be a better workman than he ever was before he heard the Master's call. But in his occupation he now sees not merely a means of making a living or accumulating wealth. He sees in it an avenue of service for His Lord. His life is infinitely larger and more worth while than it was before. There come to him satisfactions that were undreamed of in the past. For Jesus has brought to him a larger, nobler purpose.

3. The life with Christ is an expanding life, because it is life with ever-widening horizons. Think how amazingly Jesus pushed back the horizons of Simon's life. When first they met by the Galilean Sea, Simon's world was a very little world. We would call him provincial in the extreme. At the most none of these fishermen had probably ever been farther than to Jerusalem once a yaer. Their whole life was lived within the narrow limits of one of the smallest of Roman provinces. Their horizon was bounded by the margin of the lake on which they sailed their boats. They had little interest in anything outside of the concerns of their fishing business.

And then came the invitation: 'Come ye after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men.' And behold how He began to push back their horizons. He taught them to think in terms of the ever-growing Kingdom of God, beginning 'in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth.' John became the beloved Bishop of Ephesus. Andrew travelled through all the countries surrounding the Black Sea; Thomas and Bartholomew are said to have journeyed as far as India; and Simon Peter was martyred in Rome.

Jesus is still pushing back the horizons of men. The old narrow Jewish exclusivism is banished

from human thought. Jesus turns our thoughts and purposes outward from our narrow self-centred life and we become conscious of our neighbours. We begin to think in terms, not of our own rights and privileges, but of our responsibilities and opportunities of service. The circle of our benevolence extends from those who are immediately related to us by ties of blood or friendship and includes our whole community. Then the boundaries are pushed still farther back and we are interested in other communities, in distant parts of our own land; and yet again, and our neighbourhood takes in China and India and Africa. World service becomes a challenging opportunity. Every revelation of human need to which we have the power of responding becomes for us an obligation of wider service. So Jesus is constantly pushing back the horizon. For the life with Christ is an ever-expanding life.[1]

[1] C. E. Schofield, *The Gospel of Opportunity*, 59.

Present-Day Faiths.

Methodism.

By the Rev. A. W. Harrison, M.C., B.Sc., D.D., Westminster Training College, London.

No great division of the modern Church bears in its spirit and structure so much the imprint of one personality as Methodism does. John Wesley still lives in its ministry, its worship, and in all its Church courts. Yet, like many other great reformers, he would have desired least of all to be regarded as an innovator. The master passion of his life was the endeavour to recover primitive Christianity. The conservative instinct which perpetually endeavours to rediscover what is best in the past, while it is prepared to lop the mouldering bough away, is calculated to leave more abiding results than the more radical temper which has for its initial motto that of Ezekiel, 'I will overturn, overturn, overturn it.' Wesley's effectiveness in Church history is due to the fact that in his personality was that rarest of combinations—the great evangelist and the ecclesiastical statesman. It was indeed fortunate that his profound interest in ecclesiastical history came before his call to the work of an evangelist. Wesley had reached the mature age of thirty-five before he discovered in a 'heart strangely warmed' the real mission of his life. He was not, therefore, in danger of losing the sense of proportion when driven by this new-found 'enthusiasm' to preach his gospel in almost every parish in England. He took no step forward without finding precedents for his action in early Church history, or that justification which urgent necessity alone could provide for a mind that was eminently balanced and sane.

Although in 1738 his days of laborious study were at an end and those of practical administration were about to begin, yet for the remaining fifty-three years of his life his mind continued to be remarkably receptive of new ideas. He continued to read persistently and widely and was prepared to learn something from any and every man whom he met. If so simple a soul as the Moravian, Peter Böhler, was able to help him so much at a critical moment in his life, then God might speak some new message to him by any one of His children. We are therefore impressed not so much by the originality of Wesley's mind as by its wide hospitality and by the amazing way in which he put his discoveries into practice. He was a strong Churchman with a very eclectic mind, prepared to surrender his dearest prejudices at the bidding of Truth.

The prejudices of Wesley were those of a High Churchman, in the eighteenth-century use of that term. In his own mind he considered himself loyal to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England to the day of his death. He strongly deprecated the idea that the Methodist societies should break with the Established Church. They began as religious societies in connexion with the Church similar to those already in existence, some of which dated back to the days of Charles II. The spirit of the revival, however, made them missionary and aggressive, alive with contagious zeal. They claimed not only nominal members of the Established Church, but strayed dissenters and thousands who had not even a nominal Church membership beyond that of baptism in infancy. Had the Church of England known the day of its visitation it might have found a place in its organization for a

new order of friars, and Wesley's lay preachers would have been welcomed as the helpers of the parish clergy. Many of them might have been ordained, for there was a great shortage of incumbents, especially in new industrial centres. But the eighteenth-century Church was not only destitute of vision, it had neither leadership nor policy. Its Convocation never met and its bishops were largely non-resident. In the earlier days of the movement, the persecution of the Methodists was led by the clergy, and Wesley was driven unwillingly and step by step along lines that made separation almost inevitable after his death. His attitude to the Church is strangely similar to that of Thomas Cartwright and the early English Presbyterians; with this difference, that in the reign of Elizabeth it was possible to make uniformity compulsory, while in the days of the Georges, although much of the Clarendon Code was still on the Statute Book, it had become impossible to suppress a movement like the Evangelical Revival by State action. Neither Cartwright nor Wesley had any intention of leaving the Church; they merely wished to restore it to its apostolic condition. Cartwright had little of Wesley's missionary fervour, but he had a similar aim and came to similar conclusions on some important points of Church government. The main object of both men was to bring the English Church back to the state of the Church of the first three centuries, as they understood it.

Wesley's influence as evangelist and ecclesiastic is alive in Methodism to-day. As the spirit is more than the body, and life comes before organization, let us look at the subject of evangelism first. The distinctive quality of Methodism to the people of the eighteenth century seemed the violence of its religious enthusiasm, an enthusiasm closely akin to madness. Memories of the excesses of Anabaptists and Puritan sectaries at the time of the Commonwealth made 'enthusiasm' a very alarming proposition. Wesley himself dreaded extravagance and prayed for 'a calmly fervent zeal' for himself and his followers. In the main his prayer was answered. The Methodists brought a new warmth into the religious life of the land, and some of it they have preserved to this day. The saying of Augustine that 'one warm heart sets another on fire' was never better exemplified than in the case of John Wesley. May 24th, 1738, can hardly be regarded as the date of his conversion, but it was the beginning of his world-mission; a new discovery of the greatness of redeeming love sent him out of the little room in Aldersgate Street with a strangely warmed heart prepared to set on fire the hearts of thousands. Methodist hymns are full of the symbolism of fire, as the element that burns up evil and spreads with startling rapidity over the landscape. Fervour was the first contribution that Methodism made to the lifeless Christianity of their day. It expressed itself not merely in their ceaseless activity in evangelism:

> My every sacred moment spend
> In publishing the sinner's friend,

but in the new passion that glowed in their worship. They sang hymns to an extent that no Christian congregations had ever done before; and such hymns! The output of Charles Wesley as a hymn writer is without parallel, and although the Methodists no longer call their hymn-book *Wesley's Hymns*, yet there are four hundred and seventy-five even in the present collection that claim that name. The Methodists sang the joy of their religious experience, and the hymn-book became also their great devotional manual. Its familiar lines rose to their lips not only as they went about their daily work, setting out like Seth Bede, repeating:

> Dark and cheerless is the morn
> Unaccompanied by Thee,
> Joyless is the day's return
> Till Thy mercy's beams I see,
> Till Thou inward light impart,
> Glad my eyes, and warm my heart.

but when they came to die it was the hymn-book they still quoted on the death-bed. 'Our people die well,' said Wesley; and he left them an example, singing almost in his last words his brother's hymn, 'I'll praise my Maker while I've breath.' Like Francis of Assisi, he went to meet God singing. Even when the Methodists took over the hymns of their contemporaries they put a new quality in them. Doddridge wrote:

> Ye humble souls that seek the Lord,
> Chase all your fears away;
> And bow with *pleasure* down to see
> The place where Jesus lay.

John Wesley altered 'pleasure' into 'rapture,' and in that single change expressed the difference the Revival had made to Christian emotion.

The secret of this new fervour is not far to seek. It arose not from a new fear of hell, as some critics of the movement suggest, but from a new discovery of the love of God in Christ. Watts-Dunton has coined an apt phrase to account for the great literary awakening at the beginning of the nineteenth century; it was due, he says, to the Re-

naissance of wonder. That new birth of wonder had spread far and wide in the hearts of the common people of England long before it flowered in beauty in the poetry of Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, and Keats. But the wonder in the heart of the people had its source in religion ; a new vision of the world in the light of the Cross :

> Hence our hearts melt, our eyes o'erflow,
> Our words are lost ; nor will we know,
> Nor will we think of aught beside,
> My Lord, my Love is crucified !

In assessing Methodism's contribution to catholic Christianity, enough has not been made of the hymns of the revival, not merely for their own inherent worth, but as the best expression of the real secret of the movement.

Methodists are still warm-hearted, and they still love to assemble in great gatherings and sing emotional hymns. They are often the victims of the illusions of the mass meeting. Declining success in evangelistic effort in the ordinary chapel services has led them to cover the country with great mission halls in all the big centres of population. These costly enterprises, and indeed all the complicated activities of a highly centralized system, are supported with astonishing generosity, but it can hardly be claimed that there is the same missionary ardour as in the early days. Perhaps the best modern expression of that characteristic fervour is to be found neither in the Central Halls nor in the open-handed generosity of the Methodist people, but in what remains of a genuine family spirit running throughout the whole community. Methodism is a 'Connexional' system, and the links that bind congregation with congregation and circuit with circuit are stronger than the ties which unite any other large religious body. An itinerant ministry that was not permitted by Wesley's Deed Poll to remain more than three years at any one place, has done much to unify the whole system. Ministers travel all over the country making friends everywhere, keeping alive the same traditions, meeting in the family reunion at the Annual Conference, or in the District Synods, and finding there not only their fellow-ministers but laymen whom they have known in former circuits. In spite of their size the Methodist Churches still continue to be large families, though whether the same spirit will remain when they all come together in a still larger group may well be doubted. The same family spirit expresses itself in the Circuit system, where the stronger churches give their support to the weak and all combine together for new enterprises and expressions. Suburban life is not so friendly to this tendency as the country town, the mother of many daughter churches, yet it is the Circuit system that has carried Methodism through many of the acute problems that have followed the War. In the individual church Methodism can claim no monopoly of the family spirit, yet every society was in Wesley's mind a very closely-knit corporation, and the classes and bands brought the members into much more direct relation with each other than was the case in any other communion. The ideal once again finds its expression in the hymn-book : hymn after hymn might be chosen from the section 'For the Society Meeting, Giving Thanks, Praying, Parting' to express this, but we will quote from one of the quaintest of them :

> How good and pleasant 'tis to see,
> When brethren cordially agree,
> And kindly think and speak the same !
> A family of faith and love,
> Combined to seek the things above,
> And spread the common Saviour's fame.

Many aspects of this family sentiment have changed, but the ideal still has its appeal, and no members of the modern Church in England are such persistent 'Swanwickers' as the Methodists. Their old love for religious fellowship remains and is a very valuable element to contribute to any new form of reorganized Church life. Dean Inge, in a somewhat caustic and sceptical discussion of the Lambeth Appeal, saw no hope of any response to it save perhaps from those whom he described as 'our warm-hearted Wesleyan friends.' It is true that he seemed to suggest that this was due to the fact that a warmth of heart among the Wesleyans carried along with it certain compensating defects in intelligence, but we still prefer generous emotion to intellect and still preserve something of that catholic spirit which Wesley inculcated in his famous sermon on the text, 'Is thine heart right, as my heart is with thy heart ? If it be, give me thine hand.'

If the most important innovation introduced by the Methodist movement was a change of temperature, this came directly from Wesley the evangelist. But Wesley was also an ecclesiastical statesman, and he had not studied the early history of the Church in vain. He could find parallels in previous days for his love-feasts, his watch-nights, for the employment of lay preachers, and even for something that corresponded to the Class Meeting. He described the classes as resembling the periodical gatherings of the catechumens of the early Church ; the quarterly class tickets he compared to the *tesserae* and to the *commendatitia* or commendatory letters given to members of the early Church. He

found the Love-feast or *Agape* minutely described by Tertullian, and in Bingham's *Antiquities* were many details about the early Vigil or Watch-night. The love-feast has now ceased to be a regular observance in all the churches of Methodism, and is only held occasionally at special times and a few places where its popularity survives, but the Watch-night service in the closing hour of the old year has become common outside Methodism. Watch-night services were originally held monthly, but were afterwards restricted to New Year's Eve to avoid any possibility of scandal. Of these special and distinctive means of grace the most important is the Class Meeting. To this day every church member must have his name on a class book and be under the spiritual direction of a leader. The class leaders were under-shepherds of the flock of Christ, and many of them still do splendid pastoral work. Originally the societies were divided into classes of about a dozen members which met regularly on some week-day under the leadership of some one specially qualified to be a director of souls. Instead of resorting one by one to the Confessional, the Methodists confessed their sins to one another. They gave their experience of temptation, of deliverance, of doubt and fear, as well as of faith, hope, and love. As they talked one to another, listened to the counsel of their revered leader, and sang their beloved hymns together, they found strength for the conflicts of another week in an unsympathetic world. The Class Meeting has changed its form in many places, but there are still thousands of classes meeting week by week, and wherever vital religion of a fervent character is to be found some such form of intimate fellowship seems to be a necessity. The Class Meeting was the germ-cell of Methodism, and has been in the past so invaluable that it must be regarded as one of the greatest contributions that Methodism has made to our common Christianity.

While the Class Meeting has meant so much to the members, it has perhaps meant even more to the leaders, for such responsible work creates in earnest men and women a spiritual and sympathetic character. This brings us to another fact about Methodism which explains much of its remarkable development in the Colonies as well as at home. No religious community has given such wide opportunities for lay workers in the Church not merely at the business routine of serving tables and sitting on committees, but in the spiritual activities of the Class Leader and the Local Preacher. There are circuits in Wesleyan Methodism to-day with thirty-six chapels and only three ministers, so that Sunday by Sunday thirty-three of the pulpits in such a circuit are filled by lay preachers. There are to-day in the various Methodist Churches in Great Britain over forty thousand local preachers who labour for the bread that perisheth for six days of the week, and are prepared if necessary to go out to some remote village to offer the bread of life to others on the seventh. The best apology for their labours is that heard by Ian Maclaren in a Cheshire Methodist chapel from a farmer who was a rather poor preacher; at the end of his sermon he acknowledged his limitations, but added, 'You may ask me why I, who am a poor preacher, venture to proclaim the gospel to others. It is because I cannot eat my bit of bread alone.' But the local preachers have numbered in their ranks some of the greatest preachers Methodism has produced. Their self-sacrificing work has made them read and think, and they have become leaders in the social as well as the religious life of their districts. The influence of the local preacher is written deep in the political life of England as well as in the churches where he has learnt the art of speaking. Forty years ago Canon Jessopp said of the Primitive Methodists of East Anglia that in hundreds of parishes 'the stuffy little chapel by the wayside was the only place where the peasantry had enjoyed the free expression of their opinions, and where under an organization elaborated with extraordinary sagacity they had kept up a school of music, literature, and politics, self-supporting and unaided by dole or subsidy—above all, a school of eloquence, in which the lowliest had become familiarized with the ordinary rules of debate, and had been trained to express himself with directness, vigour, and fluency.' It can scarcely be questioned that Methodism has given its members (whether men or women) remarkable privileges and responsibilities in religious service.

In the quotation from Canon Jessopp is a reference to the Methodist organization that had been 'elaborated with extraordinary sagacity.' The tribute is not undeserved. Wesley's was the mind that constructed the organism which remains in 1927 in essence what it was in 1791. The complete severance from the Church of England that followed Wesley's death demanded wisdom and statesmanship of a very high order if the gains of the eighteenth century were to be preserved. God provided the men for the task, and however much we may regret the manifold divisions of Christendom, we believe that it was in the order of Divine Providence that so elastic and effective an organization should have been evolved in the great colonizing days of British expansion.

Wesley was a strict Episcopalian, but in 1746, after reading King's *Account of the Primitive Church*, he came to the conclusion that bishops and presbyters were of the same order and that he was qualified to ordain his preachers to the ministry. It was only at the close of his life and for exceptional cases that he was driven to take this extreme step, but it is interesting to observe that he gradually organized his societies into a system that was in essence Presbyterian. The Leaders' Meeting corresponds to the Kirk Session, the Circuit to the Presbytery, the name Synod is now used by both Methodists and Presbyterians for the next higher court, since the former have changed their old term the District Meeting to Synod, and finally the Conference corresponds to the General Assembly. Methodism, therefore, in the British Isles is now more akin to Presbyterianism than to the Church of England, especially as the old doctrinal difference can hardly be said to exist.

The last generation has witnessed the decay of much that was characteristic of the old Methodism. Charles Wesley's hymns are neither sung nor known as they once were; the percentage of Methodists who give their experience regularly in class must now be comparatively small; if Watch-nights and Covenant Services are continued the Love-feast tends to die out; ministers' terms of three years in a circuit are extended to four, five, six, and more years; old phrases of our peculiar language of Canaan are disappearing; denominationalism is dying, only the catholic elements of evangelical Christianity tend to remain. This may be because God intends to begin some great and new period in His Church by leading the different members of scattered communions back to their original unity after separation has served its own especial purpose. If at such a time Methodism as a separate entity ceases to exist, its ideals of close fellowship, of the family spirit in churches and groups of churches, its wide use of the amateur as well as of the professional in the pulpit, and something of its amazingly effective organization must remain.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

It is no surprise to find Professor Johannes Meinhold's *Introduction to the Old Testament*[1] appearing after seven years in a second edition; for, as an Introduction, it has struck out a new and fascinating path of its own. Whereas most Introductions confine themselves to the literary problems, analysis, construction, and probable date of the various books, Professor Meinhold has written an Introduction which really introduces the student not only to the literature, but to the great fields of history and theology or religion which are implicated in the literature; so that, in addition to the facts set forth in other Introductions and here presented with calmness and maturity of judgment, we can here follow the history of the people from the earliest times down to the period of the Maccabees, and we can trace with ease every step in the development of their religious thought. These three strands of interest are woven together with great skill and subtlety, and at every point we feel that we are in the hands of a master who thoroughly knows all that may be said against the position he is defending. It is interesting to note that he regards the Decalogue as of exilic origin, that he believes the Servant in the Servant of Jahweh Songs in Dt.-Is. to be Israel, and that he rejects Hölscher's view of Ezekiel. His warning against the temptation to draw too sharp a distinction between the prophets of weal and the prophets of woe is not untimely. More than once he pays a tribute to Wellhausen, to whom Old Testament scholarship will be for ever indebted. In a very interesting discussion on the text of the O.T. and on the Hebrew language he earnestly urges upon the theological student the great importance of a knowledge of Hebrew. But the things that interest him most in the O.T. are its 'eternal values.' No better Introduction to the O.T. can be imagined.

[1] *Einführung in das Alte Testament* (Töpelmann, Giessen; geh. Mk. 7.40; geb. Mk. 9).

The social and economic conditions which prevailed in the ancient Hebrew state are discussed in a fresh and interesting way by Dr. M. Lurje.[2] He shows that the class divisions which are so

[2] *Studien zur Geschichte der wirtschaftlichen und sozialen Verhältnisse im Israelitisch-Jüdischen Reiche* (Töpelmann, Giessen; geh. Mk. 3.40).

prominent in the time of the prophets are already present in the Song of Deborah. He deals with the problems of export and import, the development of trade, the various types of industry (working in metal, weaving, and pottery), the size of ancient Hebrew cities, the population of the country (which, taking Israel and Judah together, he thinks came to about a million), etc. The condition of the slave he believes to have been nothing like so happy as it is commonly represented. The prophets, though not social reformers, exercised an enormous influence on the social movement, and their fight for Jahweh was really a struggle for a nobler social order, or, at any rate, it found its most notable expression in that struggle. The problems traversed in this volume are the same as those traversed in relation to Jerusalem by Sir George Adam Smith in the latter half of volume i. of his *Jerusalem.*

To much fine work which has been done in the investigation of the ancient Hebrew cult, largely under the stimulus of Mowinckel's *Psalmenstudien,* has now to be added a valuable discussion by Professor Hans Schmidt.[1] He believes that 'the day of Jahweh' was the New Year's Day of each year when, at the great harvest festival, Jahweh anew ascended His throne, and that cosmogony and eschatology alike took their colour from the circumstances of this festival. But he argues further that, as the chief rite of the first day of this festival, an empty chariot or lofty throne was borne to the Temple in the early dawn, accompanied by the jubilations of the people, and that to this, rather than to the ark, Ps 24 refers. The triumph of Jahweh over all His opponents was then dramatically represented, and the Divine King now appears as Judge; and in pre-Israelitic times it seems probable that this 'judgment' was made effective by the sacrifice of slaves and prisoners of war (cf. Ps 68^{21-23}). As in Babylon, the Hebrew king may also, like the god, have celebrated his accession every New Year's Day. It is the supreme merit of the prophets that they wove into the ideas represented by this festival their own uniquely ethical conception of Jahweh, and thus completely transformed the idea of the Divine judgment and of the day of Jahweh. In the course of the argument skilful use is made of the doxologies of Amos, and there are some highly suggestive emendations of difficult passages in Ps 68, the most important being in the untranslatable clause v.^{18c}, for which by a very simple change he reads בְּכִסְאוֹ הָרֵם ('the God Jah sits *on His high throne*'), which cleverly gets rid of 'the rebellious also,' etc. This is a discussion which no one interested in the reconstruction of the details of ancient Hebrew worship can afford to overlook.

[1] *Die Thronfahrt Jahves* (Mohr, Tübingen; Mk.1.50).

In *Der Mensch im Recht*[2] Professor Gustav Radbruch traces the conception of man which underlies the legislation of successive periods of history, and shows that the legislation is conditioned by that conception, the legal ideas of our own age, for example, being largely conditioned by the conception of 'the collective man.'

The varied and far-reaching influence which Professor Deissmann has exercised is attested by the interesting collection of essays[3] contributed to celebrate his sixtieth birthday by colleagues, friends, and pupils. Early Christianity, the Grammar of the Koine, studies in particular words and phrases like δύναμις, ἀναδείκνυμις, σὺν χριστῷ, Paulinism, and other cognate topics are represented by discussions to which four English-speaking scholars make not the least notable contributions. Professor A. T. Robertson writes on 'New Testament Grammar after Thirty Years,' Professor Milligan on 'An Early Scottish Lexicon of the Greek New Testament,' Rendel Harris writes 'On the Trail of Marcion,' and B. W. Robinson on 'Influences leading toward the Conversion of Paul.' The practical interests of the Christian Church, for which Professor Deissmann has stood as earnestly as for scientific research, are ably represented by the concluding essay of Söderblom on 'Evangelical Catholicity,' in which he makes the interesting confession that he feels more at one with his Roman brethren who longingly pray and work for the unity of the Church than with Evangelicals to whom the realization of this unity is a matter of comparative indifference.

From the Catholic standpoint Professor Gaston Rabeau has written a comprehensive Introduction to the Study of Theology.[4] It deals with the object and method of theology, and with its auxiliary sciences such as philology and psychology. Rabeau writes with his eye not only on theological students, but on unbelievers who stand outside Catholicism, but who are genuinely desirous of making its acquaintance. The writer is well informed, he

[2] Mohr, Tübingen; Mk.1.50.

[3] *Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann zum 60 Geburtstag* (Mohr, Tübingen; geh. Mk. 18; geb. Mk. 21).

[4] *Introduction à l'Etude de la Théologie* (Librairie Bloud & Gay, Paris; 24.00 fr.).

knows the Protestant as well as the Catholic literature, and he has an eminently fair mind. It is of great interest to note that, at a time when there is a tendency in Protestant theological seminaries to relax the linguistic demand, this Roman Catholic scholar urges upon students of theology the importance of knowing not only Latin, but also Greek, and even Hebrew. 'The theologian who wishes to be really familiar with the sacred books of the Old Testament must read them in Hebrew.' It will be well, he remarks, not only to know New Testament Greek, but even to acquire some notion of the history of the Greek language. Protestants who seek an easier way should lay these remarks to heart.

The not very numerous publications of Lucien Gautier have been supplemented by a little volume of essays or lectures,[1] published since his death, and prefaced by an interesting account of his career and personality from the pen of a friend. The essays are as valuable as they are pleasant to read. The subjects discussed are Luther and the Old Testament, the Rechabites, Post-exilic Judaism, Deutero-Isaiah, and Jeremiah, while a concluding essay defends the translation of כהנים by 'priests' (*prêtres*) as against the word 'sacrificers' (*sacrificateurs*), which has unhappily been reintroduced by the French version published by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1910. Gautier was a Protestant of the Protestants, and in this chapter, as everywhere, his book is aglow with his passionate love of the prophets, who represent the Protestantism of the Old Testament as the priests represent its Catholicism. This explains his warm tribute to Luther alike as translator and exegete, and also his appreciation of the synagogue, whose worship was a sort of precursor of our modern Protestant service. His judgments of men and movements are characterized by a fine balance: he knows the good as well as the weak points of the scribes, who were much more than 'sincere hypocrites.' In discussing the Rechabites he makes the penetrating, if somewhat humorous, remark that to the average Israelite of the time Jahweh was in charge of the Ministry of War and Foreign Affairs, while the Baals presided over the departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce. Gautier, like Rabeau, was a strong believer in the study of Hebrew, following in this the precedent of the great Luther, two of whose words he quotes: 'I would like all young theologians to learn Greek and Hebrew,' and 'I have often urged the learning of Hebrew. I would not exchange the little Hebrew that I know for thousands of golden pieces. Learn this language, if you do not wish to be taken for beasts of the field.'

[1] *Études sur la Religion d'Israël* (Édition la Concorde, Lausanne).

Professor Auguste Gampert stoutly champions the Mosaic authorship of the Decalogue,[2] in its earliest form. Its exilic origin and the view of it as a résumé of the prophetic teaching seem to him alike indefensible, and he brings forth solid critical arguments in support of the traditional view. The prophets, he says, were no more the founders of ethical religion than the Reformers were the founders of Christianity: their religion was rooted in the religion of Moses. It is interesting to see here, as in other matters, the swing of the pendulum back to traditional positions. The old defences are gone, but criticism itself has furnished others much more substantial.

The modern critical view of the Old Testament has created problems for the day-school teacher, towards the solution of which he is entitled to look for some guidance to the experts. Such guidance he will find in a little brochure [3] of thirty-one pages entitled 'The Significance of the Old Testament for Religious Instruction.' In it Dr. Weiser shows that criticism, so far from having destroyed the value of the Old Testament, has made it more than ever an apt vehicle for the training of the young. He sketches briefly the three branches of its literature—the historical, the prophetic, and the poetic—and then traces through them the development of Hebrew religious thought. Three points in particular he emphasizes—the supremely attractive power of the religious personalities of the Old Testament, the concreteness and vividness of its narrative, and its presentation of morality as rooted in religion. The teacher should welcome a literature which furnishes him with such material for influencing the mind of youth. But further, it creates a sense of universal history, and reveals that history inspired by a purpose: it insists upon the social aspect of duty, and it emphasizes the importance of the religious community to the individual religious life. The discussion is well fitted to reassure as well as to instruct teachers and others whom rumours of criticism have perplexed.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

[2] *Le Décalogue* (Imprimerie la Concorde, Lausanne).

[3] Artur Weiser, *Die Bedeutung des alten Testaments für den Religionsunterricht* (Töpelmann, Giessen; Mk.1.20).

The Gospel of Jesus.

Jesu Evangelium, with the sub-title 'A Historic Account of the Preaching of Jesus,'[1] is a volume of supreme merit, from the pen of Dr. Sir Lyder Brun, one of the most distinguished professors of the Norwegian National University. The book treats of Jesus and the forms and methods of His preaching and teaching; His relation to Scripture and tradition; His thoughts about God and man and religion; His Messiahship and all involved in that; His influence on the disciples and their mission; and, finally, the gospel of Jesus, and the gospel about Jesus.

It is a pity that so few in our own land are acquainted with Norwegian, and so are unable to benefit by Professor Brun's great work. We know of no Scandinavian volume in the theological domain to compare with *Jesu Evangelium*, for its scholarship, freshness, interest, and practical value. The book is remarkably well balanced, the section on the Son of Man being the longest but particularly interesting. And we have never read a more informative account of the condition of the country, the religion, and the time of Christ than in the section that deals with the historic presuppositions for the preaching of Jesus. We have found no specially Lutheran tendency in the book, nor any point on which we feel seriously inclined to disagree with the conclusions arrived at by the author. He himself, in the closing paragraph of the Introduction, says: 'Undoubtedly many may find my attitude to tradition too conservative and at the same time think that I have not escaped modernising Jesus. On the other hand, there will possibly be those who deem that my attitude to the authorities is too free, and that I have pushed Jesus away to a bygone age. I cannot expect that I have everywhere hit the proper mark. But it is my conviction that the union of reverence and criticism which I have sought to carry out in regard to tradition, and the wedding of accurate historic research and direct religious conception which I have striven to realise in regard to the words and personality of Jesus, indicate the right line of work.'

J. Beveridge.

Pau, France.

[1] Forlag H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard), Oslo, 1926.

The 'Chaldaeans' in the Book of Daniel.

By the Reverend H. H. Rowley, Shantung Christian University.

In his book *In and Around the Book of Daniel*, Charles Boutflower says: 'It is one feature of the controversy which has so long raged round the Book of Daniel that points once looked upon as fatal to the early date of that Book are seen on further investigation to be proofs of its authenticity. This is the case with the "Chaldeans" who figure so prominently in the narrative portion. The defenders of the orthodox view would now be as sorry to lose the presence of those jealous, contentious individuals as to have the once much-debated, much doubted-of Belshazzar removed from the scene.'[1] In a former article (*Expositor*, Ninth Series, vol. ii. pp. 182 ff., 255 ff.) the present writer has shown that the account of Belshazzar in the Book of Daniel must still be regarded as fatal to the 'orthodox' view of its date. In the present article he proposes to re-examine the question of the 'Chaldæans,' both in the light of Boutflower's arguments and in the light of other considerations which he leaves unnoticed, and to show that no sufficient reason has been advanced to dispute the verdict of Sayce,[2] that 'the use of the word Kasdim in the Book of Daniel would alone be sufficient to indicate the date of the work with unerring certainty.'

[1] P. 35.

I.

The term 'Chaldæans,' wherever we meet with it in the old Testament, except in Daniel,—and it is found not infrequently, ranging from the earliest to the latest documents included in the Old Testament,[3]—is used in its ethnic sense. This use is particularly common in the writings of the prophets who were contemporary with the Neo-Babylonian Empire.[4] That this is so is in no way surprising,

[2] Quoted in Driver, *Daniel*, p. l.

[3] Gn 11^{28} 15^{7} (J), 2 Ch 36^{17}.

[4] Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah.

for the dynasty founded by Nabopolassar was a Chaldæan dynasty. For the statement that Nabopolassar was himself a Chaldæan we have no very sure testimony,[1] though we have one direct Biblical statement that Nebuchadnezzar was a Chaldæan,[2] but it is reasonable to infer that the dynasty was Chaldæan. For it is clear that it rested on Chaldæan supremacy. Rogers says: 'It is not possible to prove that he (*i.e.* Nabopolassar) was either of pure Babylonian or of Chaldæan origin. The kingdom which he founded was, however, plainly Chaldæan. The king's supporters were Chaldæans, and as the years went on the Babylonian influence quite gave way to Chaldæan.'[3] It is therefore natural that we should find in contemporary Hebrew writers the term 'Chaldæans' used in its proper ethnic sense.

In Daniel, however, side by side with its use in an ethnic sense,[4] we find it commonly used of a learned class of students of the occult.[5] This usage is entirely confined to Daniel in the Old Testament. It is found, however, amongst the Greek writers of a later age. It first appears in Herodotus, about a century after the period in which the story of Daniel is cast, and thereafter in Strabo and Diodorus Siculus.[6] On the other hand, this use of the term is devoid of any support from the inscriptions. Hence Schrader says: 'The signification "wise men," that we meet with in the Book of Daniel, is foreign to Assyrio-Babylonian usage, and did not arise till after the fall of the Babylonian empire.'[7]

This Boutflower meets by begging the question. He frankly recognizes that the usage of Daniel is unparalleled in the Old Testament or the inscriptions. He says: 'In the Old Testament the name Kasdim, "Chaldeans," is invariably used in an ethnic sense until we come to the Book of Daniel';[8] and again: 'When we turn to the Assyrian inscriptions we find the word *Kaldu*, "Chaldeans," used invariably in an ethnic sense.'[9] He proceeds to show that Herodotus uses the term to denote the priests of Marduk in the great temple Esagila in Babylon,[10] and infers that, as Herodotus visited Babylon only ninety years after its capture by Cyrus, this was also the usage in the sixth century B.C. This is scarcely cogent. To recognize that the usage of Daniel is at variance with all known contemporary sixth-century usage, but is in harmony with known later usage, would hardly seem to lead to the conclusion of a sixth-century origin for that book. Moreover, though only ninety years may have elapsed between the conquest of Cyrus and the visit of Herodotus, we cannot ignore the important change that had taken place in the status of the Chaldæan race. The fact that the term was used in a non-ethnic sense nearly a century after the fall of the Neo-Babylonian Empire would lend no support whatever to the theory that it was so used under the Neo-Babylonian kings. In the days of Herodotus, when the Chaldæans were racially insignificant, the term might have developed its other significance, but it can hardly be supposed that in the height of their pride and power, and in their own royal capital, the Chaldæans used their racial name in any but a racial sense.

J. D. Wilson proposes to settle the question by a false analogy, which equally begs the question. He says: 'Just as we call a scholar a "Grecian" who understands the Greek language, so they who knew the ancient tongue were termed Chaldæans.'[11] Here, in the first place, the assumption that Chaldæan was no longer a spoken language is unwarranted. The Chaldæans were a Semitic people, whose home was in the coastal regions south of Babylon, but whose language 'was the Babylonian cuneiform, almost identical grammatically and lexically with the Assyrian.'[12] Their inscriptions are in this language, and it is certain that this was the language of the government.[13] But even if Chaldæan had been a dead language, the parallel would not hold. For surely Wilson would not suggest that *in Athens* a student of Classical Greek might be appropriately called a 'Grecian.' The analogy he presents is, indeed, a serviceable one, if he would but accept its conclusion—namely, that this use of the term 'Chaldæan' could only be of foreign origin, or belong to a time when the Chaldæans, as a race, had become merged into some other race.

II.

It is not, of course, denied that there was in Babylon, in the sixth century B.C., such a caste of

[1] Boutflower refers to a statement of Alexander Polyhistor in this sense. See *op. cit.*, p. 37.

[2] Ezr 5^{12}.

[3] *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, ii. 493. Cf. Olmstead, *History of Assyria*, p. 633, where Nabopolassar is held to have been in all probability the son of Bel-ibni, the Chaldæan.

[4] 9^{1} 5^{30}.

[5] $2^{2.\ 10}$ 4^{7} 5^{11}; perhaps 3^{8}.

[6] Driver, *op. cit.*, pp. 12 f., adduces passages from these writers.

[7] Quoted in Hastings' *D.B.*, i. 368*b*.

[8] *Op. cit.*, p. 35. [9] *Ibid.*, p. 36.

[10] *Vide ibid.*, p. 39.

[11] *Did Daniel write Daniel?*, p. 57 f.

[12] *D.B.*, i. 368b. [13] So Nöldeke in *D.B.*, i. 281.

wise men as is referred to by later writers, or, as appears in Daniel, under the name 'Chaldæans.' What is denied is that there is any reason to suppose that they were called by that name at that time. Moreover, Boutflower is only confirming what has long been recognized when he argues that the learned class that is known to have existed was a priestly class,[1] and it may be agreed that the Book of Daniel correctly portrays them. Diodorus Siculus,[2] in describing the class he calls 'Chaldæans,' says: 'Appointed primarily to attend to the worship of the gods, they devote their lives to philosophy, enjoying especially a reputation for astrology.'[3] We may therefore readily allow that Boutflower may be right in urging that the priests of Marduk correspond to the description of the 'Chaldæans' in Daniel and in Herodotus.

He is on less sure ground, however, when he argues that they were called 'Chaldæans' because they were recruited exclusively from the Chaldæan race. In support of this suggestion he produces nothing that can really be called evidence. In this connexion, indeed, he calls special attention to the interesting fact that in the documents that have come down to us from the Neo-Babylonian age, 'the word "Chaldean" is never found either in an ethnic or in a class sense.'[4] One would expect him to draw the conclusion from this that the use of Daniel is unsupported, therefore, by the known usage of the age to which he proposes to assign it. Instead, he argues from this that the Chaldæan conquerors ceased to call themselves by their proper racial name, and he suggests reasons for this. He then proceeds: 'What still remains a mystery is how, being dropped in a national sense, it became attached to the priesthood of Bel in a class sense. Perhaps the simplest explanation is that in the days of the New Empire that priesthood became exclusive and only admitted to its ranks men of pure Chaldean lineage.'[5] It will be observed that the absence of contemporary evidence of the use of the word in *either* sense is not only held to be consistent with Daniel's use of it in *both* senses, but is held to prove that it must have *ceased* to be used in its hitherto accepted sense—the sense too in which the contemporary Jeremiah and Ezekiel used it—and at the same time to show that it *was used* in a new sense. This is a strange use of the argument from silence, and one is puzzled to understand how it can have so impressed its author.

We may pause to wonder at the psychological impossibility of his suggestion. Boutflower thinks that the Chaldæan conquerors may have dropped their racial name out of consideration for the susceptibilities of the conquered. 'Possibly Babylonian vanity has something to do with this. It may be that the name "Chaldeans" was offensive to the Babylonians, as savouring too much of conquest by the foreigner, so that whilst a man might be a Chaldean, yet if he aspired to become a ruler of Babylon, he must both "take the hands of Bel," and call himself a Babylonian.'[6] Yet a moment later we read: 'In the days of the New Empire the priesthood became exclusive and only admitted to its ranks men of pure Chaldean lineage,' and then: 'As, then, the conquerors generally were content to sink their origin, so the Chaldean priesthood may have been no less proud to retain it.'[7] We are asked to believe, then, that the people of Babylon tamely suffered their religion to be gravely interfered with, and their priesthood to be radically changed, and to have the change even flaunted in their face in the proud use of the name 'Chaldæan,' so long as the king solemnly pretended to be a Babylonian. We are asked to believe that these people, who had been under the foreign yoke of the Assyrians for years, were so very susceptible *except where their religion was concerned*, and that the conquerors reserved all their pride of conquest for the sphere of religion. This is wholly to ignore the place which religion holds in the heart of men, and to ignore all that is known of the place of religion in Babylonian life, and of the power of the Babylonian priesthood. So great a revolution in the religious sphere is wholly unlikely to have been carried through so simply and so calmly as Boutflower supposes, and it may safely be said that if the 'orthodox' case for Daniel relies on such theories for its defence, it cries aloud for burial.

That the name 'Chaldæan' subsequently became attached to the priesthood amongst foreign peoples is a fact which calls for some explanation, but that it became so attached in the days of Nebuchadnezzar can hardly be inferred from the lack of its use in contemporary documents. We may best suppose, with Delitzsch,[8] that the usage arose because Babylonia and Chaldæa were from early times the chief seat of astrological learning. To foreign peoples 'astrologer' denoted 'Chaldæan,' since

[1] Cf. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 657.

[2] Quoted at length in Driver, *Daniel*, p. 13.

[3] For the importance of dreams and their interpretation to the Babylonian priestly caste, see Jastrow, in *D.B.*, Extra Vol., 563*a*.

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 40.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 41.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 40 f.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] *Vide D.B.*, i. 368*b*.

the most famous astrologers were Chaldæans or Babylonians—and since the Chaldæan dynasty had eclipsed the Babylonians, the latter term was not used. And since the astrologers were priests, 'Chaldæans' became used to designate 'priests' in the pages of Herodotus. It is unnecessary to assume that when Herodotus visited Babylon, the Babylonians called their priests 'Chaldæans,' but rather that, as Herodotus was writing for Greeks, he employed terms in the sense in which they would be understood by his readers, and that he used the term 'Babylonians' to denote the ordinary citizens, in order to distinguish them from the priestly astrologers, whom the usage of the Greek tongue called 'Chaldæans.' It is wholly unlikely that there was an ethnic cleavage between the priests and people of Babylon.

Moreover, Boutflower has involved himself in a further difficulty, of which he appears to be unconscious. For if the priesthood of Bel constituted the 'Chaldæans' and consisted exclusively of men of the Chaldæan race, then Daniel is plainly unhistorical, for it represents a group of Hebrew youths as being selected for admission to the order (1^4), and a Hebrew as being exalted to the position of chief of the order (2^{48}). It thus appears that Boutflower defends Daniel by throwing it over.

III.

We may turn to examine a further difficulty which he does not face. How can we suppose that a loyal Hebrew, who, according to the story, was prepared to risk everything again and again rather than be disloyal in the least particular to the religion of his fathers, should have consented to be a heathen priest—nay, even the high-priest of a heathen faith? The defenders of the authenticity of Daniel usually find in Ezk $14^{14.\ 20}$ 28^1 references to the Daniel of the Book of Daniel. In that case we must believe that the contemporary Hebrew priest Ezekiel regarded this heathen priest as a pattern of righteousness and wisdom, though another Hebrew contemporary denounced in Deutero-Isaiah heathenism and all its works in no uncertain fashion.

It is fair, however, to note that Dr. A. C. Welch has no difficulty in supposing that a loyal Jew might have consented to enter a heathen priesthood in this way. He holds that the first part of Daniel had its origin in Babylonia, and related the story of certain typical Jews at the Babylonian court. He adds: 'There may even have been a historical kernel in them, and a memory of some distinguished Jews who were taken into the service of their Babylonian masters.'[1] He even holds that this is a mark of a genuine Babylonian background. 'Daniel has no hesitation in accepting office under it (*i.e.* the Chaldæan kingdom) and in serving it loyally. He asks mercy for the Chaldæan magicians, and even becomes their head.'[2]

It is impossible, however, to accept this. Jews may have taken service under the Persian monarchs, but we must remember that the Persians broke the Babylonian yoke, and treated the Jews with consideration. The Hebrew prophet could welcome Cyrus as the Lord's Anointed—the Messiah of Yahweh[3]—and one of the early acts of Cyrus was to sanction the return of the Hebrew exiles to their Fatherland and to authorize the rebuilding of the Temple.[4] Moreover, there was considerable affinity between the religion of Israel and that of Persia. Kuenen[5] says that these two religions had more in common than any other two religions of antiquity. Certainly the Old Testament represents the Persians as religiously akin to the Jews. Cyrus is declared to have attributed his conquests to Yahweh, the God of heaven,[6] which may imply the identifying of Yahweh and Ahura Mazda,[7] and it may have been under Persian influence that from this time on we find the name 'God of heaven' for God, while Persian influence in Jewish theology would seem to have been deep and lasting. But however this may be, there is no evidence of Jews having accepted *religious* posts under the Persians. Much less, then, can we imagine such an ardent Hebrew as Daniel entering the Babylonian priesthood. For it must be emphasized that the various classes of men who are described in Dn 2^2, and classed together under the name of 'wise men,' were all priestly classes, and even though it might be argued from 2^{48} that Daniel became the general head of all the groups, and that he was not in the particular group of the 'Chaldæans,' this would not carry us far. For this would still leave Daniel as the Arch-Priest. Moreover, we are told in 1^4 that he was definitely trained for the 'Chaldæan' order. When we turn to Is 47, we gain a glimpse of the way in which Babylon and her rulers were regarded by the Jews, and it is marked by the intensest hatred. Especially is the author's scorn

[1] *Visions of the End*, p. 54.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 52.
[3] Is 45^1.
[4] Ezr $1^{1\text{ ff.}}$
[5] *Religion of Israel*, iii. 33, quoted in Menzies' *History of Religion*, p. 402.
[6] Ezr 1^2.
[7] But we must not fail to note that Cyrus also, in his Inscriptions, attributes his victories to Marduk. *Vide* Rogers' *Cuneiform Parallels*, pp. 380 ff.

poured out on the magicians, in v.[13], which forms an odd commentary on the suggestion that Daniel's story of a pious Jew becoming head of the magicians is a bit of true local colour.

Welch remarks that 'these faithful Jews are singularly lax according to the views of later times as to heathen customs.'[1] He might with equal truth have said 'according to the views of the period of the Exile.' For a faithful monotheist to be a heathen priest involves so singular a laxity as to be a contradiction in terms. Welch further adds: 'All this implies an attitude of Judaism to its own law and to the world around it which is wholly foreign to the atmosphere of Jerusalem, especially under the Macedonian dynasty.'[2] This is wholly to miss the point. There was, of course, a Judaism in the second century, including even high priests, to which this attitude was not foreign, though it cannot be supposed that Daniel issued from its midst, for its laxity was not combined with strictness. That there existed a lax party during the Exile is less certainly attested, though doubtless true, but that there was any section which combined laxity with strictness in this fashion is no more borne out by contemporary evidence of the Exilic period than of the Macedonian, and is, indeed, quite inconceivable. Indeed, at no period can a faithful and strict Jew, least of all one who was prepared to throw his life away for his faith, have taken this attitude to *contemporary* heathenism. It is not the mark of local colour, but the evidence that the story was not written in the age in which it is cast.

IV.

But, indeed, quite apart from the question of whether or no Daniel would have been willing to be incorporated in the priestly caste of the Chaldæans, it is impossible to believe that he would have been admitted. For Zimmern says: 'The different classes of priests formed among themselves exclusive bodies with their own traditions. In this connexion the gild of soothsayers was specially exclusive, the office descending from father to son, and very strict rules being laid down as to physical condition as a qualification for priestly service. Similar, though presumably not quite so stringent, regulations would apply to other gilds.'[3] From what is known of the Babylonian priesthood, it is wholly unlikely that the king would intervene to recruit the order with foreign captives, or would interfere with their exclusive traditions, for the privileges of the priests were jealously guarded, even against the monarchs themselves.

While, therefore, Boutflower is right in supposing that the priesthood of Marduk was a close corporation, he is doubtless wrong in assuming that the Neo-Babylonian monarchs confined its membership to men of their own race—quite apart from the conflict of this theory with the narrative of Daniel. He adduces a tablet to show that two of the priests of Marduk sat on a judicial bench in Babylon, in a case in which a dependant of a high Chaldæan official was concerned. This neither proves that all the priests were Chaldæans, nor even that these two priests were Chaldæans.[4] It merely shows, what indeed was already well known, the position and power of the priesthood. It is altogether insufficient to warrant the assumption that the Neo-Babylonian kings radically changed the composition of the priesthood.

V.

Again, another difficulty confronts us. In Dn 2[12] we read of Nebuchadnezzar's command to kill all the wise men of Babylon, including the 'Chaldæans.' It is quite impossible to imagine even Nebuchadnezzar daring to exterminate, or even to order the extermination of, the powerful order of priests at the great shrine of Marduk. Still more impossible would it be to imagine this, if Boutflower were right, and these priests were not merely a privileged class 'fit to rank with the notables of the land,' but of the conquering race, and numbering amongst them the king's younger brother.[5] The order was much too powerful to be treated in this way. To quote Zimmern once more: 'In view of the important place which religion occupied in the life of the Babylonians and Assyrians, the prestige and power of the priests were at all periods naturally very great. Whenever any of the kings, as, *e.g.*, Sennacherib, attempted to free himself from the tyranny of the priesthood, his action simply recoiled upon himself, and a

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 52. [2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Vide* Hastings' *E.R.E.*, ii. 318*a*.

[4] It is amusing to read Boutflower's remark that 'Neither Bania nor Shamash-ibni (the two priests in question), we may feel sure, would be at all flattered to find themselves classed with the wandering fortune-tellers mentioned by Juvenal.' Apparently he is quite unaware that it is he himself who has classed them together. The people he is controverting deny that these priests were ever called by their contemporaries 'Chaldæans,' in the non-ethnic sense we find in Juvenal. It is Boutflower who seeks to prove that these powerful priests were also called 'Chaldæans.'

[5] *Vide* p. 43.

reaction always set in which only intensified the power of the priests.[1]

It is, moreover, especially difficult to believe that Nebuchadnezzar should have determined on this extermination of the priests, for his inscriptions reveal him as a man singularly under the influence of religion, and particularly under the influence of the Marduk worship, in whose interests he completely destroyed the rival sanctuary of Bel at Nippur.[2]

We have, indeed, in the story the indication that we are dealing with a work of art, not of history, in the record that the captain of the guard sought Daniel, who was completely ignorant of all that had passed in the king's court, to begin the execution with him. It may, of course, be assumed that the command had already been carried out in the case of the leaders of the order, who had aroused the king's wrath, and perhaps more widely, but the impression created by the story is that Daniel saved the order, and since immediately afterwards [3] we find Daniel being appointed to be 'chief governor over all the wise men of Babylon,' we cannot think of them as exterminated, but must suppose that Daniel was to have been the first one slain, and saved the entire order. This is dramatically effective, but historically improbable.

VI.

We conclude therefore

(1) That there is no evidence that the term 'Chaldæans' was used in any other than an ethnic sense in the sixth century B.C., and that any other use under a Chaldæan dynasty is almost inconceivable.

(2) That there is ample evidence of its use in a non-ethnic sense amongst later writers, to denote the same class of people that Daniel designates by that name, and that this class consisted of priests.

(3) That it is impossible to suppose that a faithful Hebrew should become a heathen priest, but that we have here the mark of a non-contemporary hand.

(4) That we cannot suppose that a close caste, like the Babylonian priesthood, would have admitted Daniel, or that Nebuchadnezzar would have dared to appoint him to the headship of the order.

(5) That our knowledge of the position of the priesthood and of the character of Nebuchadnezzar alike makes it unthinkable that he should contemplate the extermination of the priestly caste.

Against these positions Boutflower presents no defence. He recognizes the lack of contemporary evidence of the use of the term 'Chaldæans,' and proceeds to demonstrate its already well-known non-contemporary use. With the remaining points he does not deal, but builds a theory of a priesthood of exclusively Chaldæan nationality, for which he provides no real evidence, and which is at variance with the Book of Daniel, which he is defending. For his theory, therefore, the 'Chaldæans' must continue to be a source of disturbance, witnessing to the fact that we must not seek in the stories of Daniel for history, but must rather see in them the literary form in which the author clothed his passionate call to the men of his day to be loyal to the faith of their fathers, to believe that the proud oppressor would be humbled, and the despoiler of temples and profaner of sacred treasures cut off, and that the day of deliverance, sudden and sure, abiding and unshakable, was at hand; witnessing, too, to the fact that the author was not a heathen priest or a magician, who dreamt and who interpreted dreams, and who preserved a correctness in his own life, but that he was a man in whom the urge of God's Spirit was felt, whose soul was stirred by the challenge of events, and who sought men with his message—a man who stands in the true succession of the Prophets of Israel.

[1] *Loc. cit.*

[2] *Vide* Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 646.

[3] 2^{48}.

Contributions and Comments.

Mark ii. 10.

All New Testament Greek students are indebted to Professor Hubert Pernot for his illuminating article on 'Greek and the Gospels' in The Expository Times for December (1926). Particularly helpful are the explanations that he offers on the meaning of *ἵνα*.

There is, however, one passage which he quotes in which, it seems to me, the usage and meaning of

ἵνα can be more easily explained. I refer to Mk 2^{10}: ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ, for which I suggest the translation: 'But know assuredly that the Son of Man has authority to forgive sins on the earth. He says to the paralytic.' I regard ἵνα εἰδῆτε as a virtual Imperative and thus avoid the necessity of treating Λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ as an awkward parenthesis. And this use of ἵνα with the Subjunctive finds a close parallel in Mk 5^{23}: ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ, 'Come and lay thy hands on her.' [For this usage reference may be made to Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, pt. iv. p. 305*a* (3).]

DOUGLAS S. SHARP.

Durham.

St. Mark xvi. 8.

'They said nothing to any one.'

ALL the commentators who accept the usual modern view of the weight of manuscript evidence say, in the words of Mr. Willoughby C. Allen, 'here the Gospel ends,' and naturally are led to speculate as to what may have followed. Assuming that the First Gospel was written with a complete text of St. Mark accessible to the writer, we naturally expect to find in St. Matthew some hint as to the conclusion, if any, originally to be read in St. Mark. Unfortunately, it would appear that St. Matthew has so condensed and telescoped together St. Mark's more detailed account, that we cannot infer what the verse at the head of this note specially signified. Mr. Allen, like others before him, translates 'they told no one,' etc., and we are left wondering how and when the story came to be told, as apparently the Fourth Gospel describes, or how Mary Magdalene came to return to the Tomb.

It may be suggested that the true translation is what we have placed above: it is at least curious that the very same expression occurs also in Mk 1^{44}, where Mr. Allen translates 'say nothing to any one.' The point would seem to be that urgent haste, in both cases alike, forbade the ordinary dilatoriness of courtesy and gossiping, familiar in the East. The command in Lk 10^{4}, 'salute no one by the way,' which is paralleled by 2 K 4^{29}, is relevant to the same habit of Oriental society. The rest of St. Mark's expressions in 1^{44}, 'He straightway thrust him out, strictly enjoining him,' confirm this view in the one passage, and, if we may argue from it to the other, the women fled in such haste that they disregarded all passers-by whom they met. In this case the difficulty raised by many critics is due to their own way of translating the words.

T. NICKLIN.

Hulme Hall, Manchester.

Entre Nous.

A Personal Creed.

The Preface to *In Search of a Personal Creed*, by Mr. J. D. M. Rorke (4s. net), says: 'This little book is intended for men and women who want to find out what the central convictions are that make up a Christian view of life, and to discover whether or not those convictions are their own personal convictions. It is not likely to be of much use to any one who is in a state of willingness to be told what to believe.' Mr. Rorke's method is not to start at the top with existing creeds and doctrines, and find out how much of them are accepted and how much must be modified; but rather to start at the bottom with some conviction behind which one can't go. The foundation facts, he says, are 'yourself and the world you live in,' and from these you pass to God. It is because the realization of the world and life is not sufficiently vivid that the realization of God is not vivid. Men have no mind for God because they haven't got a big enough place to put Him in. 'Supposing, then, we have some small vision of the Throne of the Universe, can we see God upon it? And what sort of God do we believe in?' Can we catch gleams and glimpses if we are responsive? Mr. Rorke finds that we can, and that the first stage is the coming to think of God as a Person. And then the next stage is that the very process which compels us to think of God as 'at least personality' gives that personality the colours that are best summed up in the word Fatherhood, and from here we pass to the thought of the indwelling God, and lastly to Jesus Christ.

In Search of a Personal Creed is published by the Student Christian Movement. It is to be hoped that it will have a wide circulation among university students, for though it is unorthodox—Mr. Rorke, for example, does not believe in the Virgin Birth—it has the power, in quite an unusual degree, of stimulating independent thought.

The Indwelling God.

'Nine-tenths of the material we would account as "sin," we don't for a moment visualize as sin against the God we ourselves, in our inmost hearts, believe in. Sin against ourselves, perhaps; sin against others; sin against some conventional Church figure of God. But to be found fighting against the God we really believe in and adore is a fearful thing. Here is an example, which, because it has that quality, won't, it is hoped, seem trivial.

'Four schoolboys on holiday at Richmond in Yorkshire had several times come on a water-rat feeding in the middle of a little pond on the top of a hill. They stoned it, but it always dived and escaped into a drain-pipe which was the only outlet from the pond. Another day, when they were passing that way, they laid plans, and the water-rat, caught again in the middle of the pond, was faced with all four of them standing directly above the drain with armfuls of stones, and no cover anywhere. It took its one forlorn hope, plunged in and swam straight towards them. The writer can still see its little wedge-shaped head arrowing the water as it came on, with the stones splashing all round it. When it was within about five or six feet of them it dived. But this, too, had been foreseen. A big slab of stone was held directly above the entrance to the drain, and, as soon as the flitting shape was seen under it, was let go. There was a mighty splash, and when the slab was lifted the dead body of the little furry creature was under it. The boys went on; such incidents were part of the day's ploy. But the one who had been chiefly responsible for the scheme, and who had dropped the stone, had an acute revulsion. He was silent; then quarrelling with his companions; then off by himself. A mere spasm of compunction is nothing. But in some way that incident made the deepest sort of mark on him. . . . Other effects are in evidence to this day, across the gap of twelve years to forty. The essence of it was, he had been found to be fighting against God—the God of a schoolboy, if you like, but real. That little wedge on the water, coming on in the face of death, bright eye, keen brain, plucky heart, no flurry, no funking, was the symbol of what was beautiful on land or sea, of what one could believe in and adore. Any one would wish to be like that, and take sides with that. In all the books one assumed that one did belong to its side. And instead, one had been identified with the stupid, brute force that crushed it. Many readers, doubtless, will be able in similar fashion to recollect something that left a deep mark of pain or shame. Examine it, and see if it had not this special quality of sin against God—against one's own, real God.

'There's a vast difference between what we often describe as a sense of sin, and the realization that we've been fighting against the Living God—the God whom, if we don't love and adore, there's no meaning in the world or life. David passed from one to the other when he cried in his psalm of penitence: "Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned." "Thee only!" What about Uriah? What about Bathsheba? Yes, but against God supremely, that's what he means. The supreme pain and horror is the finding God as a living, indwelling Presence, through the realization that we've been on the opposite side to Him.'[1]

A Plea for the Bigger Thing.

In the Preface to *Saturday Papers*—published by the Student Christian Movement at 5s. net—Dr. Glover tells us that since October 1922 the 'Daily News' has given a column to a paper dealing more or less with matters of religion. 'For this selection from the Saturday papers I have largely to thank Mr. Hugh Martin, of the Student Movement, though he has been hampered by some interference from the author.' What Dr. Glover does not tell us, however, is that the circulation of the 'Daily News' is considerably increased on Saturdays, and that in Fleet Street it is understood that the factor which chiefly causes this increase is the Essay by Dr. Glover. The selection is an excellent one. The Essays are those of a scholar who is writing here in a delightfully easy and fresh way. They are full of pleasant allusion and stimulating suggestion. A good example of the talks is 'A Plea for the Bigger Thing,' from which we quote: 'It is not in the Gospels as we have them, but one of the Fathers of the Church gives us a saying of Jesus, which may be thoroughly genuine. It is in his vein. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God," we read in the text not always with any very clear idea of what it is we are to seek first. The "unwritten" saying is simpler: "Ask for the big things and the little shall be added unto you." What a discipline in prayer it

[1] J. D. M. Rorke, *In Search of a Personal Creed*, 62.

represents! What a criticism of our small ideas! And how close it is to his own pattern! What else does the Lord's Prayer teach—with its cumulative emphasis in the opening petitions on "Thy name, Thy kingdom, Thy Will"?

. . . . . .

'Here, by way of illustration, is a story which I heard in America. A college president found his college in sore need of funds; he screwed up his courage and went to a benevolent millionaire and asked for ten thousand dollars, but his appeal did not interest the rich man. A little later he met the rich man's son and told him about it. "You made a mistake," said the young man. "It wouldn't interest him. He's on the look-out for some such institution to which he can give a quarter of a million in a lump." . . . Then, again, our Theology is cautious, and inspired by the economies of the peasant, who thinks a bit and says less, shuts his mouth to keep his tongue from letting his mind out, lives in a little circle, ploughs a little field, saves a little money and thinks little and about little things. A poverty-stricken, canny Theology and a shrewd, cautious, safe Religion—and who can wonder that the Church does so ill? A half-hour with a Greek concordance, or some English one that hints at the Greek—thirty minutes given to Paul's compounds of the word *hyper*—might open our eyes to the scale of his thoughts of God, the freedom and range of his ideas as to what God is and what He can do. . . . The Church has suffered from petty theories about the death of Christ. Sometimes the dominating idea has been an unhistorical notion about Jewish sacrifice—a notion more in the ascendant in the third century than it ever was in the Church of the first century, and forced upon the interpretation of the New Testament on the authority of persons neither qualified to interpret it nor otherwise acceptable to Reformation thought. The idea that God had to be appeased by the offering of Christ's blood is not New Testament doctrine. Paul puts it the other way round, and offers us a profounder conception at once—"God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself." Sometimes Roman law has supplied the very terms in which Christ's mind is interpreted. But Jesus was no Roman lawyer—person, substitution, satisfaction are not his vocabulary; and to interpret him in such terms is to pour new wine into old bottles. At the best you won't get it all in. Happily, the Church has sometimes mended its bad thinking by not being logical; it has constantly believed in a Christ far bigger than its theories about him, acted on the basis of a more generous God and a more human Saviour, and been right on a scale beyond its theories.

'But there is a drawback about living on one scale and thinking on another. One of these days you pull yourself up and take your thinking seriously; and you may begin to contract your scale of living. You have been tacitly living on the basis of a great God and a great Saviour; but you find your theories only admit of a small Saviour and of a God who will go to a certain point only in helping you; and what next? You pay for your small-range thinking; or, what is worse, your children do; or, if you are a minister or professor, your people or pupils pay for it.'

Boredom.

Sir James Marchant has made a collection from the writings of Dean Inge and has published it with the title *Wit and Wisdom of Dean Inge* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). From the heading of this paragraph it may be thought that we disagree, and that very strenuously, with the estimate of the title, and so we hasten to say that many very wise things will be found in the volume as well as not a little wit—which hardly needs to be said about one whose mental and spiritual gifts have long been recognized. We quote two extracts. The first is on Boredom, and the second on Suffering:

'I want you to think earnestly of the witness which Joy on the one hand, and its antithesis, Boredom, on the other, bear to the duty and happiness of creative work, that is to say, real work, on however small a scale. The happy people are those who are producing something; the bored people are those who are consuming much and producing nothing. If you want to see examples of the latter class, look in at the bow-window of a London club in the morning, or at the carriages in Hyde Park towards the end of the season. While we are still on our probation, God punishes the useless by giving them pleasure without joy; and very wearisome they find it. We are all given the choice whether we will crawl or climb. Parasitism is open to us, if we like. Choose it, and pleasure, that apple of Sodom—may be yours; but you will wholly forfeit joy.[1]

Suffering.

'The great message of the *Cross* stands or falls with the divinity of Christ. Is it not the truth that all the rivals of Christianity fail just here?

[1] *Wit and Wisdom of Dean Inge*, 55.

All the religious philosophies of antiquity, it seems to me, shrink, in the last resort, from grasping the nettle of suffering quite firmly. They all want to make us invulnerable, somehow. There must always be a back-door of escape if the ills of life become too overpowering. Either defiant resistance, or suicide, or complete detachment, is recommended. By some means or other, the man himself must be rescued from circumstance, he must provide himself with a magic impenetrable armour. And *therefore*, the sting of pain is never drawn. The good news of Christianity is that suffering is itself divine. It is not foreign to the experience of God Himself. "In all their afflictions he was afflicted." "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." "If thou be the Son of God," said His enemies, "come down from the Cross." No; not while any man remains unredeemed. The divine suffering is not an episode, but a revelation. It is the necessary form which divine love takes, when it is brought into contact with evil. To overcome evil with good means to suffer unjustly and willingly.'[1]

Who Laughs Last?

Readers of the 'British Weekly' are familiar with the unconventional but thought-provoking, and at times provocative, articles of Quo Usque. The publication of a volume of Essays with the title *Who Laughs Last?* (3s. 6d. net) reveals the fact that Quo Usque is Mr. Frederick A. Atkins, who published not long ago 'The Durable Satisfactions of Life.' Both volumes are published by Messrs. Nisbet.

Probably the first essay—the one which gives the title to the book—is that with which there will be most general agreement. The title is taken from Mr. Galsworthy's 'Hedonist.' 'And suddenly there came before me two freaks of vision—Vaness's well-dressed person, panting, pale, perplexed; and beside him the old darkie's father, bound to the live-oak, with the bullets whistling past, and his face transfigured. There they stood alongside—the creed of pleasure . . . and the creed of love devoted unto death! "Aha," I thought; "which of the two laughs last?"'

[1] *Wit and Wisdom of Dean Inge*, 15.

The essay on War, on the other hand, is the most provocative. War is defined as 'the method adopted by the leaders of civilised nations for the settlement of disputes between governments.' But indeed there is much plain speaking in all the essays. In the essay on Labour, for example, Mr. Atkins says, 'I believe one great cause of our labour troubles is the fact that nothing has ever been offered to the workers voluntarily.' Whether we agree with Mr. Atkins or not, what he says deserves careful weighing.

Dt 3^{24}.

'Moses or not Moses—what a splendid passage, and how suggestive of the life of every man for whom religion is real or who is consecrated to a great quest or a great crusade! "Thou hast begun to shew thy servant thy greatness"—we never get beyond that, however far we go. Herrmann, in his great book, "The Communion of the Christian with God" (for which I, for one, do not cease to be grateful), says somewhere something like this: "The Christian has constantly the consciousness of being on the threshold of fresh knowledge of God." I think it is true not only in religion, but in every serious study. Ask poet or painter how he feels about Beauty; it is the same note: "Thou hast begun to shew thy servant thy greatness." I can never forget a stanza of a Keswick hymn that I once heard an old Bristol friend sing. (It is always something to have a friend's name tagged on to anything that is worth while.)

> Jesus, I am resting, resting
> On the joy of what Thou art;
> I am finding out the greatness
> Of Thy loving heart.

It seems to me an epitome of the Christian life and (if you like) of Church history. "Thou hast begun to shew thy servant."'[2]

[2] T. R. Glover, *Saturday Papers*, 11.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

ANYTHING that comes from the pen of the Chief Rabbi deserves our most earnest and respectful consideration, and this consideration will certainly be accorded to Dr. J. H. HERTZ'S *Affirmations of Judaism* (Milford; paper, 2s. 6d. net; cloth, 5s. net). These 'affirmations,' however, are not addressed to Christians, but to Jews. Their secondary aim is to unveil the true nature of Liberal Judaism and to show that it is inconsistent with, and even hostile to, essential Judaism, as the Chief Rabbi conceives it; but their primary aim is, in his own words, 'to clarify opinion, remove doubt, and strengthen love for our Faith in the minds of both groups.'

Apparently all is not well with the Jewish Church to-day any more than with the Christian Church or with the world. A new barbarism is settling down upon us, and the soul—the Jewish soul too—is being frittered away by the vulgarities and distractions of the thoroughfare and of the market-place. There is an impatience with all authority, moral and spiritual alike. There are Jews in whom the wish to remain Jews burns but feebly; and sad indeed it is to learn that 'the eve of *Tisha b'Av*, the hour when in sorrow and anguish the House of Israel has for eighteen hundred years and longer read the Lamentations of Jeremiah, is not infrequently selected for dances and balls by American Liberal congregations.'

Dr. HERTZ passionately believes that the essential spirit and the real mission of Judaism are gravely imperilled by that form of it which is commonly known as Liberal, of which the most brilliant exponent in this country is Dr. C. G. Montefiore. What, then, is the real Judaism, as Dr. HERTZ understands it? It is not, as the late Dr. Krauskopf defined it, 'merely the *ism* of little Judæa,' which is now outgrown. It is nothing less than 'a religious civilization—a spiritual culture aglow with a passion for righteousness,' nothing less than the sanctification of human life. But we imagine that Dr. Montefiore himself would be not unwilling to accept these definitions. Speaking broadly, the point where they part company is in their attitude to the Torah. The Liberal Jew could part, without a pang, from most of its multitudinous ceremonial regulations, because to him the supreme thing in the Old Testament is the prophetic spirit: to the orthodox Jew, the Torah is one of the foundations of the world.

It is in reality the modern form of the old quarrel, already visible and audible in the Old Testament, between the prophet and the priest. And there are more phases of it than their respective attitudes to ritual: there is the attitude to tradition. The real Torah, Dr. HERTZ tells us, is not merely the written text of the Five Books of Moses, but the exposition of that text given by later ages. The Oral Law, which represents the interpretation of it by successive generations for two thousand years, 'forms the soul of Judaism and gives it individuality and uniqueness among the living

faiths of men.' To the Liberal Jew this is a hard saying. The attitude it embodies towards tradition is not unlike that of the Roman Catholic Church, which again resembles orthodox Judaism in its appreciation of rite and ceremony.

But the count against Liberal Judaism is more serious even than that. It is not only that it is 'dry rationalism—irreverent and disintegrating,' and not only that its demand for a re-interpretation of Traditional Judaism that shall be in harmony with modern thought and life is essentially foolish, as there is really no consistent body of ideals which can be called modern life, nor would it be any advantage to Judaism, or, for that matter, to religion in general, to be in agreement with such a body even if it did exist. No; the real trouble is more fundamental.

It is not only that the sacred days and fasts and festivals of the Jewish year—for example, the Sabbath, Passover, Tabernacles, and even the Day of Atonement—receive short shrift at the hands of these moderns, but that some of the beliefs which are popularly supposed to be indispensable to any religion worthy of the name appear to be light-heartedly discarded. We can understand, whether we sympathize or not with, Dr. Montefiore's official declaration made on behalf of the London group, 'we recognize no binding authority between us and God, whether in a man or a book.' But we are told that German-American Liberals go the length of doubting the existence of God, His revelation to Israel, and the immortality of the soul. This is radicalism indeed, of a type so astounding that we must take the liberty to give the exact words.

Dr. Emil Hirsch is quoted as saying, 'I myself do not believe in personal revelation, nor does my congregation in Chicago.' And Dr. Hertz goes on to say, 'He also denied the immortality of the soul. In 1914, the preacher of the sermon at the Conference of American Liberal Rabbis not only repudiated the Mission of Israel and scoffed at Israel's history and martyrdom, but expressed his disbelief in God, the incumbency of the moral law, and the immortality of the soul.' It is admitted that this thoroughgoing scepticism was not representative of the general spirit of the conference, yet it seems that 'only last year a young American radical published a book on Liberal Judaism, in which he writes that he is not prepared unhesitatingly to declare that God exists or that there is a life after death.'

Certainly if utterances like these were typical, as we hope and believe that they are not, we could only share the chief Rabbi's horror of Liberal Judaism. But another element in his horror is the approximation of Liberal Judaism to Christianity, sometimes even in its Trinitarian form. Its representatives are guilty of an 'indiscriminating adulation of the Founder of Christianity,' whose whole life—we are amazed to hear—was one of 'enmity and warfare against the foundations of our Faith,' surely a singularly inept description of One who defined His mission as *the fulfilling of the Law and the Prophets*.

In particular, Dr. Montefiore's appreciation of the New Testament in general, and especially of the Gospels, seems to be anathema to Dr. Hertz. His sorrowful indignation is roused by the reminder of that distinguished leader of Liberal Judaism that it will be needful for Liberal Jewish theologians to consider the new modern interpretations of the doctrine of the Trinity, and to discuss how far these are or are not in accordance with Jewish views of the unity. On such a point Dr. Hertz will tolerate no compromise whatever.

It is not without significance that he is hostile to the dominant literary criticism of the Pentateuch. Wellhausen and his successors are represented as tearing the Torah to tatters and reducing its contents to legend and fiction, and even 'Dr. Driver and his English, American, and Scottish colleagues work for the undermining of our confidence in the trustworthiness of the Hebrew Scriptures.' There must be thousands of preachers all over the world who would vehemently deny that this is the effect of the work of these scholars, and who would gladly acknowledge that by that work their own insight

into and reverence for the Bible had been deepened.

The features which should, according to Dr. HERTZ, be emphasized in Jewish Religious Education are Jewish Religion, the Hebrew Language, the Sacred Scriptures, and Jewish History; and loyalty to Israel should manifest itself in religious observance, Synagogue affiliation, and participation in the rebuilding of the Holy Land. The fact that Liberal Judaism is so often indifferent to Zionism stamps it in the eyes of those who emphasize the Torah and ritual observance as alien to the true and essential spirit of Judaism.

The Chief Rabbi pleads earnestly for the establishment of a Jewish Public School: that would, he believes, be one effective way of preserving the values of Judaism. Education he happily defines as 'the gradual adjustment of the child to the spiritual possessions of the race, and Jewish education is consequently the gradual adjustment of the Jewish child to the spiritual possessions of Israel.'

Of special interest is the explanation given of the prayer, 'Blessed art thou who hast not made me a woman.' One rabbi interprets this thanksgiving thus, that the woman is less blessed because many of the ceremonial duties were not incumbent on her; the man, however, so far from resenting his additional burden, thanked God for it. Let us charitably hope that this is the true explanation, but we fear there are some whom it will not convince.

Recent theological literature reveals the fact that a great deal of thought is being devoted to the doctrine of the Spirit. And this is not surprising, since the truth involved in it is the truth of God's immanence in the world, and more particularly the way in which the redemption wrought out in Christ is made ours in experience. It is possible to take a very narrow view of this fact, as though the Spirit were confined within the barriers of an external organization and attached to certain forms and rituals. And it is possible to take a very vague view of it, as though the Spirit had nothing to do with externals at all. The best corrective of these extreme views is to look at what Scripture teaches us. It will be found that the Bible doctrine is both surprisingly broad and surprisingly narrow.

The Spirit in the Old Testament is simply God working in the world, and working in special ways. It is the energy of God appearing in exceptional manifestations. It is the Divine agent in creation.

> Darkness profound
> Covered the abyss; but, on the watery calm,
> His brooding wings the Spirit of God outspread,
> And vital virtue infused, and vital warmth,
> Throughout the fluid mass.

It is the equipment of all sorts of men for any special work. Bezaleel was filled with the Spirit for the erection of the Tabernacle. The prophets were qualified to speak for God by the Spirit. Gideon was made a successful leader and soldier by the Spirit. And in Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones the Spirit is the source of life and reality.

It is mainly the marvellous and the exceptional that are traced to the Spirit in the Old Testament. Yet may we not say that here we have at least a suggestion of a great truth, that all that is good and true and worthy in the world, all life and beauty, all achievement, are due to the creative ministry of God? It is only a slight extension of the Old Testament doctrine to say that the Dialogues of Plato, the maxims of Confucius, the poems of Browning, the persistence of Columbus, the heroism of a V.C., have been the inspiration of the God who is in us all and behind all the work that is sound.

When we pass to the New Testament we find an equally valuable truth in the Synoptic Gospels. There the outstanding fact is that everything in the ministry of our Lord was due to the Spirit of God. The Spirit came into His heart at the Baptism, fitting Him for all He did and was afterwards. His preaching and teaching were due to the Spirit in Him (Lk 4^{18}), His miracles were wrought by the Spirit (Mt 12^{28}), and it was in the power of the Spirit He rose from the dead. The significance of

this truth lies in this, that it makes our Lord's example a real example to us. If He was incapable of sin, if He was so far removed from us that He had resources which we do not have, His victory would be of little value to us. But if He depended on the Spirit of God, a Power equally open to us, and if He achieved all He did through this Power, then our weakness also may be sustained and our humanity perfected through the same Spirit.

It is in St. John's Gospel that we find the great Promise that was to mean so much to the early Church, and to the believer ever after. Christ promised a Spirit who was to be to His disciples all He had been. He was to 'go away,' but the Spirit was to come to men who would be lonely and discouraged and be their 'advocate,' to stand by them in their hour of weakness, to guide them as He had guided them, to lead them into truth and sustain them in their trials.

Now the wonderful thing about this Promise is that the whole New Testament (after the Gospels) is a series of examples of the ways in which the Promise was fulfilled to the letter. Take first the Book of Acts. There are three critical occasions at which the Church took a decided step from the narrow confines of Judaism to the fuller liberty of the gospel. On each occasion this step was taken under the inspiration of the Spirit. The three occasions were the baptism of Cornelius, the first mission of Paul and Barnabas, and the Council of Jerusalem (Ac 15). These were momentous occasions, on which the future of the world hung. And, at each, the decision of the Church was made consciously by the direction of the Spirit. How magnificently Christ had made good the great Promise. And how marvellous it is to watch this little band of obscure men making an incredible adventure on the bare word of their Master alone.

But the Epistles give us as clear an instance of the fulfilment of Christ's great Promise of a different kind. We wonder at the richness and depth and fullness and gladness of the religious life exhibited in these letters. But in reality they are one prolonged commentary on the Promise of Christ. The writers were humbly certain of the source of their knowledge and of the Power in which they lived their life. They do not seem to distinguish clearly between the Risen Lord and the Spirit. But they know that it is by the Spirit, who is the Spirit of Christ, they have been redeemed, and by this Spirit they are daily sustained and guided. It is a wonderful picture this in the New Testament, first, of a great Promise, and then a constant stream of fulfilment in the lives of men who turned the world upside down. If this is true, and if this power is available for to-day, surely there never has been any message greater or more joyful proclaimed to the sons of men.

Most of the articles by the BISHOP OF MANCHESTER (*Essays in Christian Politics and Kindred Subjects*: Longmans; 7s. 6d. net) appeared previously in the 'Pilgrim,' that quarterly review whose demise in January of this year was so much regretted. The papers in the first section of the volume deal with Christian Politics—such subjects as Fellowship, Christian Social Principles, God and the State, Loyalty and Democracy. The second section deals with miscellaneous subjects—one of which is Faith and Works—although Dr. TEMPLE gives it the title of 'Coué and St. Paul.'

'I had not known sin,' says St. Paul in Ro 7^7, 'except through the law: for I had not known coveting, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.' 'Here,' says Dr. TEMPLE, 'we see that trouble began through the stimulation of the righteous will by the prohibition of the law. St. Paul was "alive" in the sense that he could control and direct his conduct along right lines until he became conscious of a commandment prohibiting actions to which he had a natural, though apparently inhibited, tendency. Becoming conscious of this prohibition, he increased his determination to repress that tendency; what M. Coué calls his "will" was strengthened. But the result was not enhanced self-mastery, but loss of the self-mastery hitherto enjoyed. For with the strengthening of the "will" came a still greater strengthening of the "imagination" so that, whereas the man had

been " alive " or self-directing, he was now " dead " or moved by the blind force of an impulse. " When the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." ' On this basis the moral problem is found to be insoluble. The more the man struggles against the chain of his sin, the closer it binds him. It is the very earnestness of his effort to do right which ensures his doing wrong. ' O wretched man that I am ! who shall deliver me out of this body of death ? '

How is the moral problem to be solved, then ? St. Paul finds a solution through being caught in an experience which lies outside the scope of the conflict between ' the evil that I would not ' and ' the good that I would.' If we read without a stop from Ro 7^{5} to Ro 8^{39}, ' I have God through Jesus Christ our Lord . . . for the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death,' we shall grasp Paul's meaning. What St. Paul experienced was no help in the conflict by any reinforcement of his will. In so far as the experience was appropriated the conflict was over. ' If we imagine a man vainly toiling up a steep ascent on which he makes no headway because his footing slips down beneath him every time he strains upward, he would be helped, no doubt, by some pressure supporting his back and enabling him to make his strides longer and more rapid in succession ; but the struggle and effort would remain. It is so that many Christians think of the assistance of divine grace. It is exactly not so that St. Paul describes it. What he describes is much more like the discovery that close beside the steep and stony ascent there is a moving staircase, on to which the man must step of his own motion, but on which, when once he is there, he is borne without further struggle to the summit of the ascent. The essential act of the will in Christian experience, as St. Paul describes it, is surrender.'

Dr. Temple finds in the teaching of M. Coué and his school, although somewhat concealed by their terminology, the same opposition of Faith and Works. It is found in the law of reversed effort : ' when the will and the imagination are at war the imagination invariably gains the day.' For when we look into it we find that imagination is just faith, and will is just works.

M. Coué used the word ' imagination ' in an unusual way. He did not mean by it having a visual or an auditory image, but rather the concentrating of attention on an idea. This is clear when we think of his formula of helpful auto-suggestion, ' Every day and in every way I am getting better and better.' It is this concentration on an idea which will succeed when what he called ' will,' but which is rather ' self-consciousness,' will fail. The conflict of which M. Coué spoke is not between will and imagination ; it is between the idea that we take for granted and the idea that we picture ourselves realizing. The idea that we take for granted will always win, because whatever attention is given to it is given without anxiety, or what St. James calls double-mindedness. The ideas that we take for granted constitute our faith ; the ideas that we picture ourselves realizing, even with great effort, are our works. And faith always beats works.

An illustration makes the argument clearer, and Dr. Temple writes : ' It was my good fortune several years ago to take the chair for Dr. Walford Davies on an occasion when he was teaching about two hundred working men and women to sing songs in unison. The result of his method was something astounding. We began by singing a well-known song, and we did it very badly ; the quality of tone was harsh, the rhythm was uncertain, the pitch was various, and the expression non-existent. Two hours later we were singing songs that we had never heard till that evening, and we made a truly glorious row. As soon as we were convinced that we sang very badly a song that we all knew we were switched off to songs quite new to us. Dr. Davies told us to listen as hard as we could while he played the tune to us ; he called for a real effort of concentrated attention. Then he said, " Now sing it. Don't *try* to sing it, but just sing it. All you have to do is to enjoy it, and the music will sing itself." . . . Dr. Davies, when things went wrong, said, " I know you are trying. Stop trying. Just enjoy it." But I have

also heard conductors say with manifest justification, "You are not trying a bit." What is wrong is not the effort but the direction of the effort. The effort should be not an effort to perform but an effort to attend. It is often hard to keep the mind fixed on the job in hand, but it is the essential act of will and the condition of all success. The singer should think steadily of the beauty of the music and enjoy it; then the performance will spontaneously be as good as his natural and technical qualifications permit. The seeker after health should fix his mind on health, and (if he has visual imagination) picture himself moving healthily, and he will become as healthy as conditions permit. The Christian should fix his mind on the beauty of the Holy Love, which is God, and is set forth for our adoring contemplation in Jesus, and Holy Love will both possess his soul and govern all his actions.'

In the fourth chapter of Philippians St. Paul writes, 'Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are august, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue and if there be any praise, occupy your minds with these things.' The Will chooses its master or its absorbing interest and maintains its loyalty by a perpetual act of choice.

What of bodily health? We want something better than M. Coué's formula. In it the attention is focused on the self, even though it is on an improving self, and we are urged to tell ourselves what is not true in the hope that it will become true. The Christian formula will rather be, 'God's Will is my welfare, God's Will is my welfare.' 'For the Christian God's will is the sovereign power; it accomplishes its purpose except so far as it limits itself to leave scope for the free action of created wills. I can shut God almost entirely out of my life; but if I open my heart and mind towards Him, He will work in me what He pleases, which will be better than I could have hoped for myself. But the heart and mind must be truly open; there must be expectation; and the limits of expectation will set limits to the full working of God in me. We have mostly excluded the whole bodily side of our nature from our expectation of divine blessing. This is false to the Gospel and implies a disastrous dualism in our philosophy. There is only one universe; and God is the life of it.'

It is our prevailing custom in these Notes to enlarge on some point handled or suggested in new publications. The reasons for that are obvious and sound. Yet our readers may pardon us if, once in a while, we go back to an older book to see if a re-reading has anything fresh for us. We have been re-reading Otto's great work *The Idea of the Holy*, and have got the suggestion of a suggestion which, we think, is of great interest, and perhaps some importance.

Readers will remember how Otto adduces the 'theophany' in the closing section of the Book of Job as an illustration of the 'numinous' in the Old Testament; and shows how Job is led from querulousness to adoration by an overpowering realization of *mysterium tremendum*. Now it is not Otto's concern to explain *Job*, and it is not ours to consider the 'numinous.' But Otto here suggests to our mind an answer to the questions, What is really the point of God's answer to Job? Is there an answer at all, and how does it meet Job's problem?

We are probably justified in saying that that has proved a perplexity to every reader of what Carlyle called 'the greatest book in the Bible or out of it.' How did it meet Job's problem of unmerited suffering to describe to him Behemoth and Leviathan, and ask him questions he could not answer about such things as the lightning, or the ostrich, or the wild goat? To a man ruined in home, happiness, and health, and clamouring with well-nigh frenzied insistence for an answer to his indignant *why?*, what answer is it to put such a catalogue of problems, the bearing of which on his case is so far from obvious? Yet it was an answer. Job felt that it was, and he must be allowed to know best. Expositors have been hard put to it to discern even a glimmer of the light which undoubtedly Job saw and which gave him

peace. Their views will be found sufficiently indicated in, for example, Strahan's masterly work, 'The Book of Job Interpreted.'

Well, Otto has suggested to us where light may be found. It has not to be searched for hidden away in the long chapters in which God is represented as speaking to Job, nor has it to be distilled out of them. It is so prominently placed that it has escaped most eyes. It lies in the very opening words, 'the Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind.' *Out of the whirlwind*—those are the only really important words; all that follows is by way of illustration—illustration of the 'whirlwind' features of human experience—the bizarre, the irrational, the insoluble, the unknowable, or the unmanageable. If the story of Job be historical at all, what happened was this. Job, puzzling his brains almost to distraction about the ways of God, suddenly either witnesses or remembers a whirlwind, that incalculable, inexorable, but majestic natural phenomenon. In the world of Nature, so orderly, so rational, there is the whirlwind to be remembered. And in the experience of man or of nations there is a 'whirlwind' feature too. Job had come into the path of a 'whirlwind.' In face of the whirlwind the dictum of Ecclesiastes holds good, 'there is one event to the righteous and to the unrighteous.' The question of personal merit or demerit is simply irrelevant.

So Job perceives that in the 'whirlwind' experience of suffering such as his, the question of his desert did not necessarily arise at all. There is the whirlwind, and however strange it seems, and whatever problems still remain, the realization of the fact of it has this merit at least, it opens a way out of the dilemma in which Job seemed shut up—either there is no God who cares, or I must have been a great sinner. Had Job come to either of those decisions, Satan would have been right in his contention. But between his wife, who urges him to atheism, and his friends, who press for a confession, Job finds a way out. There is such a thing as the whirlwind,—that answers his friends. God is in the whirlwind,—that answers his wife.

Again we repeat there is the 'whirlwind'—the incalculable, the inexplicable, the irrational; yes, there is all that to be possibly met in life. But God is in the whirlwind. We cannot say why the 'whirlwind' should be there: it is sufficient to know that God is in it. That is Job's view of human experience, that is Job's faith, that is what gave him peace. And even the New Testament merely makes a little more explicit what this unknown but supreme genius saw more or less clearly so long before: 'all things work together for good to them who love God.'

The Messiahship of Jesus.

III.

The Evidence of St. John (2).

By the Reverend J. O. F. Murray, D.D., Selwyn College, Cambridge.

After an interval of uncertain duration, which included a Passover and the Feeding of the Five Thousand, Jesus returned to Jerusalem for the Feast of Tabernacles. His claim to be the Bread of Life, and the discussion to which that claim gave rise, can best be considered in connexion with His self-revelation to His disciples.

St. John's account of this visit to Jerusalem gives a vivid picture of the ferment in the popular mind about Him. Even before He appeared the crowds were full of eager questionings and were sharply divided in opinion about Him. But freedom of utterance was checked by fear of 'the Jews.'[1]

[1] This title in many places in these chapters suggests 'Judæan' as distinct from Galilean (*e.g.* 7^{1} 8^{31} 11^{45}). It may be that this is always its meaning, with a few

It is noteworthy that it is only in these chapters that the question of Messiahship comes up for public discussion. The title is not found on the lips of disciples after the first chapter, except in 11^{25}. The rulers consider only the claim of Jesus to be a Prophet (7^{52}). The threat of expulsion from the synagogue alluded to in 9^{32} shows, however, that there was a tendency to regard Him as Christ, which had to be kept in check.

It is fatal to any true understanding of the narrative to impute to the protagonists on either side the bitterness of spirit with which theological controversies, whether Jewish or Christian, have made us only too familiar. If the Evangelist really represents Jesus as wrangling in that sense in these chapters, Lord Charnwood is fully justified in refusing to accept the account as historical. Whatever basis of genuine reminiscence may underlie it, his description of Jesus is out of character and cannot be true to fact. But, if we admit, as we must, that the Evangelist shows in the rest of his Gospel a singularly deep and sympathetic appreciation of his Subject, we shall hesitate long before we acquiesce in this solution.

The situation, we must remember, was unique. A New Order of human experience, a new stage in the emergent evolution of the human race, began with Jesus. It is not surprising, therefore, that the problem with which He was confronted, when He strove to give an account of Himself to His contemporaries, should have proved well-nigh insoluble. There was no language—in the nature of things there could be no language—to fit the case. Words spring out of experience, and are intelligible only in the light of it. So no words could express what Jesus was. Nothing short of His life in human flesh, His Death, His Resurrection, and His Ascension could do that. And, even so, only those who were willing to learn from Him could understand Him. Unless we realize the limitations against which Jesus was struggling, it is impossible to do justice either to the recorder of these discussions, or to those who took part in them.

The hints that the Evangelist gives from time to time of the comments current in various circles are illuminating, but we must confine our attention to the occasions in which Jesus Himself is speaking. He has, we must remember, two distinct objects in view. He has to help men to understand who He was and the work that He had come to do. He has also to keep before their minds the causes and the consequences of rejecting His claim.

His self-revelation begins with a comment drawn from Him by the popular confidence that they knew all that there was to know about His origin. It is in form affirmative, but it was meant to rouse heart-searchings. 'Ye know both me, and whence I am; and I have not come from myself, but he that sent me is true, whom ye know not. I know him; for I am from him, and he sent me.'

The first clause, though it is in strong contrast to the second, is not, I think, an ironical echo of the popular confidence, but a solemn assertion of the fact that, even as they stood, they had a real, however dim, sense of the meaning of His claim.

His next utterance follows an official attempt to arrest Him. It asserts that the origin of His mission was also its goal, and that when after His departure they began to feel their need of Him, He would be inaccessible. The people, however, fail entirely to apprehend His meaning.

Then on the last day of the Feast Jesus takes the occasion presented by the commemoration of the Divine provision made for the wants of Israel in the Wilderness to invite men to come to Him for the Water of Life, just as He had claimed to be the true Manna in the Synagogue at Capernaum. This invitation to all the thirsty is closely akin to the invitation to all the weary in a strikingly Johannine context in St. Matthew. The people are conscious of a Divine drawing in these words, but are put off by the Judæan prejudice against Galilee, which finds a voice even in the Sanhedrin.

Jesus then lays hold of yet one more of the experiences of Israel in the Wilderness as a symbol of the service that He had come to render. Israel had been guided in their wanderings by 'the fiery, cloudy pillar.' Jesus is the true Shechinah, the Light of the World, the source of the Light of Life to all who follow Him.

He is at once rebuked for self-assertion, perhaps with intentional reference to His own words in 5^{23}. He makes no effort to defend His verbal consistency. He takes up the question of testimony, which their objection raises, and adds to His previous list of evidences the testimony of His own consciousness. He knew as His critics did not, His own origin and goal. And His confidence in the evidence of His own consciousness was not due to self-delusion. It was supported by the evidence of the Father that sent Him. But, as long as they refused to

easily intelligible exceptions; *e.g.* 'The Passover of the Jews'; 'The Jews have no dealing with the Samaritans'; or, on the mouth of Pilate. Their attitude is throughout critical, often aggressively hostile, though some even of them are from time to time won over. This usage strongly suggests that the writer was a Galilean.

recognize Him, they could make nothing of His appeal to His Father.

Jesus then brings them back to the question of His approaching departure. This time it is to emphasize the spiritual consequences for them of separation from Him. Failure to recognize Him must issue in death. The form in which He expresses this failure is a striking indication of the bankruptcy of human language. He says simply, 'Unless ye believe that I am.' No word is added, or can be, to define more closely 'What' I am. The phrase means simply that 'It is I,' 'that I am myself,' that 'I am what I am,' or possibly, that, 'I am he' (cf. Is 43^{10} LXX). It evokes, therefore, inevitably a challenge for a more explicit statement. 'Who art Thou?' And to this no verbal answer is possible. He meets it with a sigh at the hopelessness of any attempt to communicate His meaning by words, coupled with a recognition of the fact that even so the words that He used were judging them. This responsibility He can face only by virtue of His trust in the Father from whom the words came. And He had this consolation: their rejection of Him would be His exaltation, and in the end their eyes would be opened to understand the secret of His being. Meanwhile He has the constant support of His Father's approval.

This appeal was not without effect, and Jesus begins at once to apply a searching test to their incipient faith. He offers them spiritual freedom, arising from contact with reality as the result of persevering discipleship.

If Saul of Tarsus, after his conscience had been aroused, had been there, he would have felt the attraction of this promise. But to the Pharisee, proud of his own righteousness, it seemed insulting. Jesus could only repeat that as long as sin is natural to a man, he is a slave, however truly he may be a member of the household of God, adding that no one who was at heart a slave could retain his place in that household. Only the spirit of Sonship ministered by the Son could emancipate.

He proceeds to confront their pride of race with the determination to put Him to death, which came from their national refusal to accept His leadership. His words came from His experience with the Father. So He calls them to obey the message that has come to them from Him. They take refuge in the fact of their physical descent from Abraham. This vain confidence can only be broken down by being sharply confronted once more with their determination to put him to death. Such a purpose betokened a very different spiritual ancestry from that of Abraham.

The only other parentage that they can acknowledge is that of God. 'God,' says Jesus, 'cannot be in any effective sense your Father, while you reject me. The spirit that is possessing you is the spirit of a diabolic sonship. This is what explains your failure to accept the truth when it is put before you.' The Jews regard this as wild Samaritan or demoniac raving. Jesus, in answer, can only once more commit His honour into the Father's keeping. He then goes on to promise to the loyal freedom, not only from Sin, but from the power of Death.

However little the Jews understood the power of Sin, they had no doubt about the power of Death. A man who professes to deliver from Death must be more than a Prophet, more even than Abraham. But the place of Jesus in relation to the race depends not on His own claims, but on His Father's appointment. It could not be an afterthought. It had in it an element of eternity. 'Your Father Abraham rejoiced to see my day.' 'Before Abraham came into being I am he.' In other words, He claims to be the root as well as the seed of Abraham.

If we put ourselves reverently and humbly into the position of Jesus, and remember that those to whom He spoke had the truth presented to them by Jesus Himself and failed on moral grounds to apprehend it, and if we then ask ourselves if there is any lack of love in the plain speaking which is found in these chapters, I have confidence that St. John will stand the test. Must not a man who is shutting his eyes to the truth and plotting to murder the innocent be denying his Divine parentage and making himself a child of the devil? If so, what can perfect love do, but strive to open his eyes to the fact?

The healing of the man born blind and his expulsion by the Jewish authorities are followed by a comment on spiritual blindness, and by the claim of Jesus to be the Door of the sheepfold and the Good Shepherd, in contrast with the robber and the hireling. In connexion with this claim Jesus declares that the object of His coming is to bring life, and indicates that He would have to lay down His own life in the fulfilment of His duty to His sheep.

A renewed challenge to claim Messiahship is met by a reassertion of His oneness with the Father, and of the evidence that His works provided of His intimate communion as Son with the Father.

When this claim is denounced as blasphemous, He points to the evidence in Scripture to the kinship between the Divine Nature and the human. If men appointed to act as judges in the land

are called gods, because they had to declare the decision of God in disputed cases, Jesus was more than justified by His public consecration and commission in claiming to be Son of God.

The raising of Lazarus only brings the designs against the life of Jesus to a focus. In spite of this, Jesus goes up to Jerusalem for the Passover and enters the City amid the hosannas of the crowd, accepting for the first time in the Gospel public homage as King of Israel. The request of certain Greeks to see Jesus introduces a lesson on the fruitfulness of sacrifice, followed by a sharp anticipation of the Agony in the Garden, a declaration of the judgment on the Prince of this world, and of the power of the Cross to draw all men to Jesus. After one last appeal to the people to believe in the light before it is taken from them, the public ministry comes to an end.

The Evangelist adds a brief comment on the failure of the people to respond to the appeal based on the prophet Isaiah. Then after declaring the reasons which kept back some of the leaders from being true to their convictions, he concludes this section of his Gospel with a concise summary, which he assigns to no special occasion (12^{44-50}), of the teaching of Jesus on His relation to the Father and to the world as implied in His public teaching. In this He asks for complete surrender because the Father is with Him, and can be known in the revelation that the Son has given of Him. This revelation is light, and can dispel the darkness which covers all the world that knows not God. The coming of the light brings judgment to those that neglect it. But the purpose of its coming is not judgment, but salvation. Any clear call of duty which comes to a man and is spurned by him will rise against him 'in the last day.' It is a word of the Father mediated by the Son. It springs from the eternal fountain in the heaven—from the Will of the Father mediated to men by the willing obedience of the Son, who has learnt in His own experience that Life Eternal is the issue of obedience, and can therefore utter the words that His Father gives Him to utter in spite of the judgment that is their immediate result.

Such is the account that St. John gives of the efforts that Jesus made to explain His claim to those in authority, and to the people at large, before their trial day came on the first Good Friday. There remains one further direction in which Jesus had to make clear the position and authority which He claimed to one whose office forced him to come to some conclusion with regard to the claim, inasmuch as the supreme judicial authority with the power of life and death was by Divine appointment at that time committed to him. We should have been at a loss to conjecture the form that this exposition took, if it were not for the account in Jn 18^{33-37} of our Lord's examination by Pontius Pilate.

Pilate is inquiring into the charge that his prisoner had been claiming to be a king. To his evident surprise, Jesus does not deny the charge; though He makes it clear that the sovereignty that He claimed differed fundamentally in origin, and in the force that lay behind it, from that which it was Pilate's duty to exert as the representative of Cæsar. To avoid the possibility of mistake, Pilate repeats his question: 'Art thou a king then? and Jesus answers, Thou sayest that I am a king. For this have I been born and for this I came into the world, that I may bear witness to the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.'

These are clearly words of inexhaustible significance. As Dr. Westcott points out, they are 'the good confession' which He witnessed before Pontius Pilate: corresponding to the confession before the High Priest. They reveal the purpose of the Incarnation, not now as the fulfilment of the promises of God to His chosen people through the prophets, but in terms which make it the answer to the age-long searching of the human spirit. It is, however, by no means easy to determine how far Pilate was in a position to grasp their meaning, especially in relation to the subject immediately under discussion.

We may assume that he was an educated Roman gentleman, familiar with the points at issue between the rival schools of philosophy, Stoic, Epicurean, and Academic or Sceptic, that flourished in his day. If so, a claim to kingship based on a witness to the Truth would have suggested the well-known Stoic doctrine that the Wise Man was the true king. Plato had declared that his ideal State must await realization until a king appeared who was also a philosopher. The Stoic went further and maintained that the ideal Wise Man, with or without a crown, had the essential characteristics of a king. He, and he alone, had the vision of Truth, the intelligent apprehension of reality, which made him master of his circumstances and gave him the capacity to guide and rule his fellows.

Jesus, therefore, in basing His claim to kingship on His witness to the Truth, at least gave Pilate a reminder of the existence of a Kingdom, in this world though not of it, in which Cæsar's writs did

not run, and which his legions could not help him to annex. Pilate's answer, 'What is truth?'—in spite of Bacon's epigram—was no jest, though he did not wait for a reply. It was the natural answer of a 'Sceptic' when asked to give his assent to any positive proposition. It suggests that He had caught at least this much of the Lord's meaning. A deeper understanding of the words, as they themselves declared, depended on a spiritual condition which Pilate, alas! failed to fulfil. As his subsequent conduct showed, he believed in the innocence of his prisoner, but dared not face the consequences of acting up to his convictions. He was not 'of the truth,' and so failed to hear the voice of the King.

We must not, of course, limit the words to the meaning which Pilate was capable of apprehending. There is no reason to suppose that they were addressed exclusively to him. The truth expressed in them concerns the whole world. The examination was held in open court, though religious scruples prevented the prosecution from setting foot in it. So there may well have been among those who heard 'the Good Confession' some who were better qualified than the Roman Governor to appreciate it. If, for instance—and it is by no means an extravagant supposition—'the other disciple' who had followed His Master into the house of the High Priest, followed Him on into the Governor's palace, and himself heard the cross-examination which he reports, the reference to the Truth would have recalled at once the revelation to St. Thomas which he had heard but a few hours before. And the two utterances would have begun at once to give and receive light each from the other, as they cannot fail to do as soon as we take them together.

Such in outline is the account in St. John of the claims put forward publicly by our Lord in the course of His ministry.

Here, as in St. Mark, His consciousness of Himself as 'the Christ the Son of God' is all-pervading. With the details of that consciousness as it affected His personal relations to His Father in heaven we have dealt only in passing, as they came into expression when He was on His defence before the Sanhedrin. This part of the subject demands a fuller treatment, which must include an examination of the more intimate self-revelation that He made in His intercourse with His disciples, especially in chapters thirteen to seventeen. For on this side also of the life which he records, St. Mark leaves us asking searching questions and looking for fuller light. But our immediate subject is limited to the consideration of the claim to authority over the people of God that Jesus put forward on the strength of it, and of the steps that He took to make His claim clear to the constituted authorities in Jerusalem. In St. Mark our attention is concentrated on the final crisis, and we are given no hints of any preparation that Jesus had made for the inevitable conflict. St. John shows us how Jesus all through His ministry had been in close touch with the Jewish authorities, the Sadducean High Priests and the Pharisaic lawyers. There is nothing in this that conflicts with any positive statement in St. Mark. There is much that throws welcome light on St. Mark's account of the last week of the ministry. And, we may add, the account of the examination of Jesus before Pilate in St. John goes far to explain the action of Pilate, which in St. Mark is so summarily treated as to be utterly unintelligible as it stands (15^{2-5}).

St. John's account is self-consistent. The only point in which we are conscious of a residual conflict of testimony lies in the impression that we gather from Mk 8^{29} that faith in the Messiahship of Jesus was the goal of discipleship, while Jn 1^{41} seems to make it the starting-point. When we consider how fluid the conception of Messiahship was, we shall, I think, hesitate long before we regard it as an irreconcilable contradiction. And still longer before we assume that the error, if there be an error, is to be put to the account of St. John.

Literature.

DR. C. G. MONTEFIORE ON THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

In the first volume of Jackson and Lake's 'The Beginnings of Christianity' (1920), Dr. Montefiore wrote: 'I should be far from attempting to deny the original elements in the Gospel teaching. The summons not to wait till they meet you in your sheltered and orderly path, but to go forth and seek out and redeem the sinner and the fallen, the

passion to heal and bring back to God the wretched and the outcast—all this I do not find in Rabbinism; *that* form of love seems lacking.' This is frankly said from the standpoint of Liberal Judaism, and an engaging frankness pervades the same writer's latest work, namely, the second edition revised and partly rewritten of his Introduction and Commentary to *The Synoptic Gospels* (Macmillan; 2 vols., 30s. net).

The first edition was published in 1909, and it has been out of print for a number of years. This second edition contains many quotations from books and articles by English, French, and German scholars that have been published in the last seventeen years, and to make room for them many of the quotations given in the first edition have been omitted. In the first edition the authors most frequently quoted were Loisy, Wellhausen, and Johannes Weiss; in the second edition, while there are still frequent quotations from these scholars, the scholars specially mentioned are Streeter, Burkitt, Lake, and Bultmann. Dr. Montefiore regards Streeter's 'Four Gospels' and Bultmann's 'Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition' as the two most important and valuable works upon the Gospels which have appeared since 1909.

The Introduction, which extends to one hundred and forty-six pages, is informative on many things, and in particular on the present state of the Synoptic Problem.

The Commentary is chiefly designed to meet the requirements of Jewish readers, and seeks to combine reverence towards Jesus with freedom in the discussion of His teaching and of the opinions of the Evangelists. It is the second element in this combination that has hitherto been conspicuous in Jewish expositions of the Gospels. But Liberal Judaism has taught Dr. Montefiore to be appreciative at once of the lives and teachings of many of the ancient Rabbis and of the character and teaching of Jesus. Not that he would accept the teaching of Jesus in its entirety. He repudiates it, for example, on the doctrine of the Last Things.

The late Dr. Rashdall once remarked, facetiously it is true, that his friends told him he knew too much about God to be a philosopher and too little to be a theologian. Dr. Montefiore, who by the way deeply admired Dr. Rashdall, expresses the hope that in his work he may seem to Jewish critics too Christian, and to Christian critics too Jewish; in which case, as he adds, it may be that now and then he may have said the truth.

It is because we think Dr. Montefiore often corrects in his Commentary certain prejudices and distortions of vision to which the Christian expositor is liable, and from which only an intimate knowledge and experience of Jewish thought and life could save him, that we should regard it as a good and salutary thing for him to keep at his elbow such a well-informed work as this.

But perhaps he should be reminded of the affinity between the standpoints of Liberal Judaism and Unitarian Christianity. Of this Dr. Montefiore is fully conscious, and it appears in his Commentary. Indeed, he thinks that in the distant future there may be found in the teaching of Jesus a reconciliation or meeting-point between a Reformed or Liberal Judaism and a frankly Unitarian Christianity. '*That* Judaism and *that* Christianity may find that they differ in name, in accent, and in memories, rather than essentially or dogmatically. *That* Judaism and *that* Christianity may both claim Jesus as their own.'

THE PSALMS.

We do not think that the Rev. Professor T. E. Bird, D.D., Ph.D., has any reason to cherish the fear expressed in the Preface to his *Commentary on the Psalms* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne; 2 vols., 25s.), that he may be accounted a reactionary or an obscurantist. It is a commentary of which no scholar, Roman Catholic or Protestant, need be ashamed. The Vulgate Version of each psalm is followed by an English translation of the Masoretic Text, which takes large account of all reasonable textual emendations. For example, Ps 19^{14} reads 'Withhold thy servant from strange (gods),' which presupposes זרים for M.T. זדים (cf. Vulg. *alienis*). So also Ps 49^{8} reads 'Certainly a man cannot ransom himself' (?) where the emendation אך (certainly) is, as it would seem rightly, preferred to the traditional אח (brother). There are, however, other points where plausible emendations are not mentioned: for example, the traditional text of Ps 73^{24} ('Thou wilt hereafter take me into glory') and Ps 104^{26} ('There ships move along') is accepted without textual comment. But, speaking broadly, the textual comment keeps full in view the Vulgate, the LXX, and the Masoretic Text, and is a valuable piece of work.

While the critical conclusions incline to the conservative side, the case is usually argued and not presented dogmatically. For example, while Dr. Bird acquiesces in the decision of the Biblical Commission, which 'forbids us to deny the Davidic origin of those psalms which in the Old Testament or New Testament are expressly quoted with David's

name,' nevertheless in his cautious discussion of the origin of Ps 51 he very freely admits that the last two verses were added during the Babylonian exile, which thus helped to adapt the psalm to the needs of the later Jewish community, 'in exactly the same way' as 'we recited the Ps. in our churches during the European War; at what time we also added another line to the Litany of our Lady—*Regina pacis, ora pro nobis*.' Also, while insisting that the Aramaisms of Ps 139 are not an infallible sign of a late date, he concludes the discussion of its date with the following careful sentence, 'It must be confessed, however, that the style of the Ps. is unlike that of Davidic compositions.' In spite of the admirable defence which Dr. Bird puts up for Ps 119, it is quite refreshing to hear that 'some priests find the Ps. tedious.'

There is a careful preliminary discussion of the problems usually treated in books on the Psalter—for example, Hebrew poetry (the rhythm of which Dr. Bird thinks consists rather in the balance of thought than of sound or accent), the Titles, Authorship, Date, and Subject of the Psalms. Throughout the book the scholar is more in evidence than the preacher, but there are occasionally brief 'applications' appended. Here is a comment on Ps 91^6 reproduced from the *Breviarium in Psalmos*: 'You may be a monk going for a walk by yourself in the city. During the walk you hear shouting in the circus. Some one comes up to you and says: "Let us go and have a look; there is a circus here." You reply: "I cannot; I am not allowed to go there." He may then point out to you that there are thousands of spectators in there and say: "There are 200,000 spectators in there. Are they all going to be damned while you alone are saved?" But you must bear in mind that this is the work of the devil (*symptoma diaboli*), and that many, indeed, do fall.'

THE CREATOR SPIRIT.

The Rev. Charles E. Raven, D.D., Canon of Liverpool, has gathered into a volume two sets of lectures, one delivered at Cambridge, the other at Harvard. There is nothing haphazard, however, about the combination, and probably the line of reflection had been taken deliberately in view of the double event. The book is fitly called *The Creator Spirit:* A Survey of Christian Doctrine in the Light of Biology, Psychology, and Mysticism (Hopkinson; 8s. 6d. net). The aim of the book is to show that the work of the Holy Spirit is to be seen in 'the creative as well as the inspirational energies of the Godhead; that creation, incarnation, and inspiration reveal the same eternal values; that biology and psychology bear witness to love rather than to will.' Dr. Raven is distressed by the divorce between the old piety and the new learning, and he thinks that the greatest task of this age is to liberate science from a deterministic materialism and to show that God is the same God everywhere and always. We gather from some very modest references that he himself has come to his faith from a materialistic biology, and largely on the grounds urged in this book.

That is, at any rate, a good introduction to his argument. And his argument is for a Christ-centred universe—a noble theme, and, it is only just to say, nobly pursued. Dr. Raven sees evidence of narrowness in the prevalent ideas of the Spirit which confine His operations to Church circles on the one hand or identify Him with the Risen Christ on the other. To take this latter course is to divorce Him from the First Person of the Godhead. Both, however, are errors, for the Spirit is the great creative Power in the universe, in creation and in all Nature, and also in the life of the soul. This thesis involves a survey of science and also one of psychology. The author acknowledges his debt to Professor Lloyd Morgan, whose view of emergent evolution coincides with his own main idea.

We confess to a very warm sympathy with this idea. No view will make this world intelligible that does not see the traces of God's creative and inspiring presence in every sphere of existence, animate and inanimate, natural and spiritual. There is something very uplifting in the outlook of this volume, something liberating and expansive in its atmosphere. It is carefully and interestingly written, and, because of its wide scope and its author's wide knowledge, enriching to mind as well as heart. Dr. Raven has entered on a great crusade and we wish him God-speed in it.

GREAT ENGLISH CHURCHMEN.

This month we notice three further volumes of the 'Great English Churchmen' Series, edited by Mr. Sidney Dark, namely, *St. Thomas of Canterbury*, by the editor himself, *Thomas Arnold*, by the Rev. R. J. Campbell, D.D., and *Archbishop Laud*, by Mr. A. S. Duncan-Jones (Macmillan; 6s. net each). Thomas à Becket is one of the most romantic and at the same time puzzling characters in all the history of the English Church. In his phenomenal rise from a humble origin to the highest positions, first in the State, then in the Church; in the rise

and fall of his favour with the king; in the pitiful story of his death, which all will agree was an awesome murder, and many will hold with Mr. Dark to have been a martyrdom—in all this there is material for a great story. The literary grace of the fascinating narrative is just what we expect of the accomplished editor of the 'Church Times.' The historical insight and sound judgment displayed make the volume not only a brilliant biography, but a valuable contribution to ecclesiastical history. Mr. Dark is quite frankly a 'partizan,' but, as he points out, every one who would write interesting history must be that. Dangerous doctrine, of course, unless we know just what it means, but Mr. Dark's meaning is quite plain, and we agree with him that 'sympathy is necessary to understanding.'

In a book which pleases us so much and which we can cordially recommend, there are two points which call for amendment. First, after we have read how time and again the Chancellor was entrusted with delicate negotiations, we cannot see how it can be maintained that the Archbishop 'was no diplomat.' While, as Mr. Dark makes so clear, the Archbishop was very different from the Chancellor, it is difficult to believe that diplomatic ability would or could be one of the things either renounced or lost. Second, when Mr. Dark remarks that 'there is a constant and curious resemblance between the tragedy of Canterbury and the Passion of our Lord,' he has, we think, allowed his sympathies to betray him into what at the least is a breach of good taste, and will grate upon many of his readers as something much worse.

In view of Dean Stanley's admirable and authoritative Life, there was no need for Dr. Campbell in his *Thomas Arnold* to enter into matters of biographical detail. He has wisely decided to place the emphasis of his treatment on Arnold's liberal ecclesiastical and political opinions. These he expounds very clearly in the light both of the Evangelical tradition and the Oxford Movement and of the social and ecclesiastical changes that have taken place since Stanley's day. He is also successful in bringing out Arnold's nobility and unselfishness of character, his moral intensity, his honesty of purpose.

Arnold's most lasting influence, according to Dr. Campbell, has been in the field of Scriptural interpretation, in which he fearlessly applied the historical method. 'Herein he was greatly helped by Niebuhr, whose suggestion it was that, as early Roman History might well be in substance the reproduction in a prose medium of what was originally simple epic poetry, the same might be true to some extent of the more ancient contents of the Bible.'

In keeping with the aim of this series, Dr. Campbell deals with Arnold the churchman rather than with Arnold the schoolmaster. But there is an illuminating chapter on Arnold at Rugby. We are told how he breathed a new spirit into the dry bones of pedagogic method, but that not even he—as we may gather from 'Tom Brown's Schooldays'—was able to eradicate bullying and deception from the school life. He was also influential upon the English public school system in another direction. It was in the high place he vindicated for religion. A vacancy occurring in the school chaplaincy at Rugby, he himself applied for the post. 'The business of a schoolmaster,' he said, 'no less than that of a parish minister, is the cure of souls.' This was in consonance with the great purpose of his life, which was to further the expression of the Christian idea in ordered human society. Just as every school should be a Christian school, so every State should be a Christian State.

The Oxford Movement, which Arnold opposed, and of which, had he lived, he would have been a redoubtable antagonist, was in matters of doctrine a reassertion of the main positions of *Archbishop Laud*, of whose life and times Mr. Duncan-Jones gives us an informing study, rich in detail. Laud refused to abandon the idea which had meant so much to Cranmer, Jewel, Parker, and Hooker. He believed profoundly in the Catholic, or Universal, Church; he was certain that he was a member of it, and that the Church of England was not only part of it, but shared more truly in it than did the Roman Church. Further, it was Laud's conviction that Scripture and the Creeds give us the alone necessary foundation of our faith. It was a simple faith he desired, and liberty of interpretation.

In full sympathy with these positions, and strongly critical of Calvinism and Puritanism, Mr. Duncan-Jones develops a solid and sober account of the great Churchman's career, not failing to show his human kindness and piety, his essential masculinity of character, and his zeal for a restored order and seemliness in worship. But Laud's efforts to introduce decency into worship and comprehension into religion the *Vox Populi* declared to be Popery, and his head was laid upon the block. But he died courageously and composedly. Says this latest biographer, in words revealing his own ecclesiastical sympathies, 'He saved for England the conception that the Church had a Divine and not a Parliamentary origin, and he preserved by his life, and still more by his death, the new possibility

recovered by the Renaissance—the possibility of a Catholicism that was at once supernatural and free, confident and reticent, that drew its inspiration and resources from the One Church of Jesus Christ, and yet was able to speak to the people of England in the language in which they were born.'

THE REVELATION OF JESUS.

We have received *Jesus Christ and His Revelation*, by Vacher Burch, D.D. (Chapman & Hall; 9s. net). Of the author's scholarship and wide reading there can be no question. This carefully documented volume attests them. It would be a great improvement if he would use only the current English vocabulary. 'Innumerous,' 'monition,' 'depravation' are examples of the kind of word for which he has a fondness. In a scholarly work it is better, too, to allow each sentence a predicate.

When we consider the matter of the volume, we are constrained to say that while it contains many good things, it is scarcely a good book. Had it been furnished with an index the good things it contains would have been more usable. As it is, the reader will have to discover and mark them for himself. We say it is not a very good book because (1) it is overloaded, and (2) the main topic, if there be one, is not clearly enough defined. The idea, we take it, is from studies in Jewish and early Christian literature to discover the principles of the revelation of Jesus, His interpretation of Himself and His Kingdom, His use of the Old Testament, and so on. But we must confess that amid many things of interest and value which we fully appreciate, and many criticisms with which we are disposed to agree, the 'discovery' eludes us. What precisely Dr. Burch is trying to make out, or thinks he has made out, we are not too sure. He whets our interest by seeming to promise surprising and undreamt-of revelations of 'finds' he has made. But we are as constantly left asking in bewilderment, what exactly has he found? Is it this, and if so, what is its importance? The last chapter, which deals with the Slavonic additions to Josephus, illustrates this perhaps most strikingly of all. Let us grant—a big assumption—that those additions are all perfectly genuine; what, after all, is their value beyond a fuller testimony to the historicity of the appearance of Jesus at a given date in Palestine? Their interest is certainly very great, but Dr. Burch seems overwhelmed with a sense of their importance as casting light on what Jesus was and taught. His conclusion is this: 'New evidence demands it, that Christians should take the hand of Josephus to be led back to things concerning Christ the Revealer and His Revelation which they have forgotten.' If there be 'new evidence' of such importance as that, Dr. Burch has kept it a secret. There is nothing in the chapter to justify such a conclusion. And that, we fear, is characteristic.

The Dudleian Lecture for 1926, delivered in Harvard University by Professor E. S. Drown, comes to us under good auspices from the Harvard University Press. The subject is *Religion or God?* and the lecture is published in this country by Mr. Humphrey Milford at the Oxford University Press (4s. 6d. net). The argument is one for belief in God on natural grounds, and the writer joins in the present fashionable depreciation of the 'so-called arguments for the existence of God.' Their weakness lies, he thinks, in the fact that they started outside the direct field of religion and morality, and apart from that field tried to arrive at a religious and moral result. Dr. Drown prefers to start from the whole field of religion as a fact of religious consciousness, and he finds in this widespread religious consciousness the foundation of our belief in the reality of a transcendent religious reality. There are, however, many thoughtful persons who still believe that the old proofs, properly stated, are as valid for us as they ever were, and it is doubtful whether the argument Dr. Drown presents will be found more convincing. The interest of this lecture, however, lies in its survey of the field, and this, in its way, is a masterly achievement, and in any case the reflections of so cultured a mind on this big problem will be found to repay, and more than repay, the reader's trouble in following them.

The Christlike God, by the Rev. F. J. McConnell (Abingdon Press; $1.75), is in the highest degree a thought-stirring and helpful book. It is 'a survey of the divine attributes from the Christian point of view.' The writer stresses the point that 'Christ is of God as the centre of His being, the Word which is constantly in the Divine Mind.' This, when firmly held and consistently applied, makes a vital difference in the focus and perspective of theology. 'If we think of the teaching of the divinity of Christ as resulting from progressive exaltation of Christ, we may think of God as, indeed, including Christ, but as including much besides—with God as an all-inclusive Absolute reconciling everything in Himself. If in God we

see essential Christlikeness, the focus is a little different.' Taking, then, the Christlikeness of God as the determining element, Bishop McConnell treats in successive chapters of the Divine attributes. The whole makes a very fresh presentation of the Christian doctrine of God.

It is not always easy to get an attractive title for a volume of sermons, but the minister of Cadder Parish Church, the Rev. J. Woodside Robinson, B.A., has found one in *Hearts Aflame* (Allenson; 6s. net). 'The world is looking for mercy and justice and honour. It is seeking Hearts Aflame to lead it back to God.' There is variety in Mr. Robinson's treatment. Some sermons are after the older pattern—being divided into heads, preferably three. In others there is one central idea, approached from different sides so that at last all its richness is borne in on the reader. And good use is made of illustration. In the first sermon we find the following story. 'In the eighteenth century a man called John Walker started a political movement in England. A large party gathered round him. As time went, on his followers became dangerous cranks and extremists, and called themselves "Walkerites." John Walker himself found it necessary to protect his name, and he began to explain everywhere he went that he was not a "Walkerite." It is a pertinent thought that if Christ came to Glasgow and saw the grotesqueness of much of what a great many call Christianity, might He not have to defend His own teaching and exclaim; "I, Jesus Christ of Nazareth, am not a Christian"?'

A second edition of *The Progress of World-Wide Missions* (James Clarke; 7s. 6d. net) has been called for. This is not surprising, for it would be difficult to find any one more suited to the task of preparing a compendium of missions than Dr. Robert H. Glover, considering his medical and theological training, his practical experience of eighteen years of missionary work in China, and his executive experience as Foreign Missions Secretary, and now as Director of Missionary Course in the Moody Bible Institute of Chicago. The volume is full of well-documented information and accurate statistics, and at the same time it holds the general reader's attention. The needs of study groups also have been well met.

It is a great convenience for all who are interested in the history of interpretation to have an accurate and admirably printed text of so famous a *Commentary* as that *of David Kimhi on Isaiah* (Columbia University Press, New York; $2.50). The painstaking and erudite labours of Dr. Louis Finkelstein, Instructor in Talmud at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, have furnished us with an edition which will greatly facilitate the study of that important work, which had the honour of being printed three times between 1482 and 1492, and which, like all Kimhi's work, profoundly affected later Christian exegesis. As the introduction, dealing with his life and his quality as a commentator, points out, Kimhi happily combined French traditionalism with Spanish scientific method, and this combination carried his influence far and wide. This edition of Isaiah also contains a hitherto unpublished commentary on Gn 2–4.

The Rev. R. Waterville Muncey, M.A., has issued an English translation, with introduction and notes, of *The Passion of Saint Perpetua* (Dent; 3s. 6d. net), 'the most beautiful as well as the most undisputed of all early Christian martyr-records.' The translation has been made from Dr. Armitage Robinson's edition in 'Texts and Studies.' The notes are scholarly. In the introduction it is held that the Montanist character of the martyrdom is disputable, and Dr. Robinson's opinion cited that the author of the Martyrdom may have been Tertullian himself. Mr. Muncey's chaste little volume would make a suitable Christmas gift.

One of the prime requisites for a study of the Bible (and for its intelligent exposition) is a knowledge of the background. That means, of course, a great deal. It means history, geography, social customs, religious development, political government, and other things. And a good deal of literature exists which supplies what the student needs, notably those volumes dealing with 'The Local Colour of the Bible' by Budden and Hastings. A scholarly little book has just appeared which deals with one section of the background, *The World to which Christ came*, by Mr. Frank Richards, M.A. (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net). The term 'world' is strictly geographical. Mr. Richards deals in turn with Judæa, Samaria and Galilee, Syria and Arabia, the Jewish Dispersion, the Greek World, Egypt, the Roman Empire (in various aspects, political and religious), the Parthian Empire, and even the British Isles! Nobody but a careful scholar could have written this book. It is based on wide reading and contains a large amount of accurate and necessary information which will illuminate the whole field of Biblical

interest for the serious reader. The more books of this kind we have (and read) the better equipped we shall be to grasp the situation into which Christ came.

A great deal of attention has recently been given to the subject of hymnology, since so many of the churches have been overhauling their stock of praise-forms. A charming book on the subject has been written, called *England's Book of Praise*, by the Rev. John Telford, B.A. (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net). It is historical, anecdotal, informative, and withal pleasantly written. Starting with an excellent chapter on the Psalter, it reviews all the great periods of creative praise, deals with all the great hymn-writers, tells of the origin of famous hymns, and is altogether a satisfactory account of a most fascinating theme.

It is the custom at Bedales School—the famous English co-Educational Boarding School—for any member of the Staff who cares to do so to address the boys and girls on Sunday evening. Any subject may be chosen, and it is followed by discussion. Mr. Geoffrey Crump spoke on Education and Idealism, Responsibility, The Pursuit of Pleasure, The Real and The Ideal, Sacrifice, Friendship, English Country, On Reading, On Time, and On Death. These ten addresses, direct in language and obviously sincere in thought, have now been published by Messrs. Heffer. The title is *For Weal of All* (4s. 6d. net). The exterior of the volume—black boards with green title label—is no less attractive than the contents.

Any exposition of the Words from the Cross is welcome if it is devout and suggestive. Suggestive it needs to be since so much has been written, preached, and printed on the Saviour's Seven Words. The Right Rev. Bishop Charles L. Slattery of Boston has added to the large number of such books a small volume of addresses with the title *The Words from His Throne: A Study of the Cross* (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net). It is not elaborate or 'scholarly,' but it will help devout worshippers to enter into the spirit of the Dark Hours, and it will suggest thoughts which, if not new, are always tenderly and suitably expressed.

A second edition of *A Book of Devotional Readings*, edited by the Rev. J. M. Connell, has been issued by Messrs. Longmans (5s. net). 'The contents are arranged in chronological order, beginning with New Testament times; and the endeavour has been to include what is most vital, significant, and inspired of God in the writings of the teachers of Christendom throughout the ages, as far as it is possible to do so in a volume of moderate size.'

Introduction to the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul, by Evelyn Parker (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net), contains first, a brief but very readable account of St. Paul's life and missionary labours, with, second, an exposition of the teaching of the Pauline Epistles. As one might expect in a book bearing the imprimatur of the Roman Church, the writer reads into the Apostle's words a great deal more of ecclesiasticism than a strict interpretation would warrant. But the whole is written with ability, candour, and in an earnest Christian spirit.

Love's Immensity, by Bertha Carr-Harris (Marshall Brothers; 5s.), purports to be a study of 'the progressive revelation of God through His Hebrew names.' In reality it is somewhat of a medley. Beginning with a series of trumpet blasts against Higher Criticism, Evolution, Romanism, and Christian Science, it goes on to the interpretation of the Hebrew names for God, mingling with much that is excellent a miscellaneous assortment of apocalyptic lore and astrological speculation. If the book were purged of its fanciful and critical elements it would make a small volume of good Christian reading.

Recently we referred to Dr. Hector Macpherson's account of the conflict of Science with the Church. This month we have received his *Modern Astronomy: Its Rise and Progress* (Milford; 6s. net). We are glad that Dr. Macpherson is writing so much, and all on the same high level. Here we have within brief compass an interesting and full account of the developments in astronomical science, and the work is embellished with illustrations. Specially interesting to the general reader are the two last chapters on Cosmology and Cosmogony. In the former we read, 'We are forced to admit that we have evidence of objects at a distance of one million light-years,' which means that when the eye sees them it beholds not what they are to-day, but what they were a million years ago! In the latter, Dr. Macpherson concludes 'that we are no more unique in origin than in location, and that the stellar dwarf which we call the Sun is not the only star which is attended by at least one inhabited world.'

The Romance of the English Bible, by the Rev.

Carey Bonner (National Sunday School Union; 2s. net), is the simple retelling of a well-known story 'with no pretence to originality of treatment.' The incidents are well chosen and the narrative interesting, but if the book be intended to serve as a handbook in study circles it is surely a grave omission that nothing is said of versions subsequent to the time of King James.

We have received from the Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly a copy of the *Prayer Book Measure, 192–* (3d. net), as finally proposed by the House of Bishops (published March 16, 1927).

We have also received from the Managers of the Oxford and Cambridge University Presses and the King's Printers a copy of the *Book Proposed to be Annexed to the Prayer Book Measure, 192–* (2s. 6d. net), being the Book of Common Prayer of 1662 with permissive additions and deviations approved in 1927 (published February 7, 1927). We have also received a copy of the *Book Referred to in the Prayer Book Measure, 1927* (2s. 6d. net), being the volume above-named as revised by the House of Bishops, which was submitted to the Convocations on March 29. In the Preface the need of Prayer Book revision is set forth, and it is stated that in all things the revisers have set before their eyes 'the duty of faithfulness to the teaching of Scripture and the godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers.'

Two books that will delight children of all ages come from the Religious Tract Society—*Animals of the Bible* (6s. net) and *Four-footed Helpers* (7s. 6d. net). They are both by Eleanor E. Helme, and both illustrated by Barbara Briggs, F.Z.S. The letterpress is full of information given in an admirably simple way, the illustrations are numerous and include in each book twelve coloured plates and many black-and-white drawings. The books are large, handsome, beautifully printed and bound volumes, and how they can be published at these prices is a mystery. Here are two admirable gift-books to charm the ears and rejoice the eyes of youth.

An edifying book on the Holy Spirit is not without its uses, even if it be not very scientific. Such a book has been written by the Rev. W. C. Proctor, F.Ph., and published by Mr. Robert Scott, London —*The Teaching of Holy Scripture concerning the Holy Spirit* (2s. net). The writer's critical standpoint may be judged from his statement that 'the two wave-loaves, baken with leaven,' of Lv 23^{17}, 'surely foreshadowed the Christian Church, composed alike of Jews and Gentiles.' But even this does not prevent his book from being a helpful one. It shows a careful knowledge of Scripture, and expounds uncritically but fully the whole doctrine of the Spirit. There is a great deal of sound research in the book, and many people will find it satisfying and enlightening.

Two excellent little volumes of the Churchman's Popular Library have come to hand. *Christ the King*, by the Rev. K. D. Mackenzie, M.A. (S.P.C.K.; 1s. 6d. net), is 'a study of the incarnation.' It is not easy to deal with so profound a theme in a simple and popular way, but we may say at once that the writer has succeeded to admiration. Certain careful studies in the portraits of Jesus as presented in the Gospels, followed by a consideration of the Christ of Paul and of the Early Fathers, lead on to a constructive statement of 'Who Christ really is.' The writer sums up thus: 'If Jesus Christ is indeed the central fact of history, then it is surely not beyond belief that the rays of Divine revelation should be so concentrated in Him individually as to make it possible to say that He and He alone is the perfect Image of the everlasting Light. We ought to be prepared to believe this if there is any positive reason for doing so, and no negative reason of unworthiness or inadequacy to hinder us. Whether these reasons do or do not exist, the individual must in the last resort judge for himself. But if any one still asserts that the life of Jesus does not look like an Incarnation of God, it is not unfair to ask, How, then, would *you* expect Incarnate Deity to behave?'

The ABC of Christian Living, by the Rev. Cyril E. Hudson (S.P.C.K.; 1s. 6d. net), is written in a lucid and interesting style. It treats of the growth of the soul, the science and art of prayer, the means of grace and the kingdom of God. It concludes with an appeal for the exercise of the mind in religion. The writer is an educational expert and has many suggestive things to say regarding the principles of the new psychology in their application to the religious life.

The Fact of Prayer, by Professor J. E. Wishart, D.D., LL.D. (Revell; $1.75), is a philosophic rather than a devotional book. 'Books on the subject of prayer are innumerable, and not a few of them are of such excellence that they have become classics.' Why then write another? The writer's

aim is to show that through prayer we come into contact with reality, that the instinctive needs of our souls, as they are expressed in genuine worship, form a criterion of truth in the religious sphere, and that supplication is the secret of victory. The discussion is maintained throughout on a high level; and though there may be little that is positively new, there is much that is freshly put and helpful. A notable feature of the book is the variety and aptness of the quotations with which the theme is illustrated.

Beyond the Sunset, by the Rev. H. B. Smith, D.D. (Revell; $1.50), is 'just a sheaf of sermons tied together, picked up from the pulpit of Immanuel Presbyterian Church of Los Angeles.' Coming from such a city, they might be described, fitly enough, as a series of moving pictures, so full are they of illustration and anecdote. But they give evidence of wide reading and are packed with sound sense and Scriptural teaching. They deal with the subject of the Resurrection and the conditions of the future life. Perhaps in matters of detail the writer speaks with more assurance than the evidence warrants, but he has a real message of comfort and of hope.

The Student Christian Movement has published a short study of factory life in India. The title is *From Field to Factory*, and the author Miss Margaret Read (1s. 6d. net). The scope is not sufficient to make this more than an introductory study, but the picture drawn is an arresting one. It should help in the formation of a public conscience as to the conditions under which industrial work is carried on in India.

A small book has been written by Sir Charles Marston to put the Employers' case in Industry. Sir Charles Marston is the head of a well-known firm of Motor Cycle Manufacturers. He is a member of the Church of England—indeed, he is a member of the house of Laity—and it is partly because he feels that the Church of England has been, to some extent at least, identified with other views than those which he holds that he has written *The Christian Faith and Industry* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d.). Some of his points are that modern industry is not an affair merely of capital and labour; industries must have heads and the Employer also is needed; human beings are not equal, but unequal, and so require unequal remuneration; that workers are wrong in assuming that a man helps his fellow-workers by a 'ca' canny' policy; that low costs and high wages are an outstanding feature of American industry and might be an outstanding feature of our industry here; that Trade Unions have not been entirely beneficial to the country.

Several chapters are devoted to a consideration of Christ's attitude to the industrial system prevalent in Palestine and to the attitude of the early Church. While there is very much in what Sir Charles Marston says, it would be well to read, along with this little book, some other treatment of the industrial problem, which would look for some method of dealing with extremes of poverty and riches, and of providing a fair though not necessarily an equal chance for all, and which would not lay down that the *only* way to regulate wages is the law of supply and demand. The Bishop of Manchester's volume of *Essays in Christian Politics and Kindred Subjects*, published this month by Messrs. Longmans, might be suggested.

Present-Day Faiths.

The Faith of the Baptists.

By Principal H. Wheeler Robinson, M.A., D.D., Regent's Park College, London.

The living faith of a religious group is no more to be limited to the pattern of its beginnings or subsequent history than the meaning of a word to its etymology and usage in previous generations. The word 'Baptist' itself illustrates this, for it is the abbreviation of the opprobrious word 'Anabaptist,' which was repudiated by those in this country who followed the New Testament ordinance of believers' baptism from 1612 onwards; but the word has now been accepted by Baptists and filled with an honourable meaning, as have been the equally opprobrious terms 'Methodist,' 'Quaker,' and even 'Christian.' The Baptists, like the 'Anabaptists' of the sixteenth century, were

characterized by the retention of a New Testament practice which the rest of the Church had abandoned in its original form and meaning; but it has yet to be proved that there was any historical continuity between Anabaptists and Baptists, whilst it is certain that the teaching of the first Baptists differed materially from that of the continental Anabaptists.

The first English Baptist was John Smyth (1569?–1612),[1] and the gradual development of his convictions is interesting on its own account, and significant of the future characteristics of the religious denomination of which he was the pioneer. In his first phase, that of a Puritan, we meet with him as a Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, in the last decade of the sixteenth century, and subsequently (1600–1602) as a 'lecturer,' *i.e.* a chaplain, to the city of Lincoln. His aims were those of the Puritans in general, which means that, whilst remaining within the Anglican Church, he sought to bring its worship and constitution into fuller harmony with the principles of the Reformation. In his second phase, at Gainsborough, after long thought and discussion with his friends, he became a 'Separatist,' that is, one who had become convinced that the Puritan ideals could not be realized within the Anglican communion, and required the formation of a 'separate' community of the regenerate. He accordingly became the pastor of such a community, organized simply on what we should now call 'congregational' lines. With him was associated John Robinson, the leader of the closely linked group at Scrooby. The often quoted words of the latter, that 'the Lord had more truth and light yet to break forth out of His holy Word,' may be traced back to the influence of his friend and leader, John Smyth, who had based the Gainsborough Church on a covenant containing the words, 'to walk in all His (Christ's) ways made known, or to be made known unto them, according to their best endeavours, whatsoever it should cost them.' It should not be forgotten that the assertion of religious liberty, of the right to worship God and organize a Christian Church according to a conscientious interpretation of the New Testament, went hand in hand with the humble conviction of these men that they knew only in part and prophesied in part, and with their professed and real readiness to be led to fuller knowledge. John Smyth was acting in simple obedience to his own Church covenant at Gainsborough when he advanced to his third phase in Amsterdam, whither he had gone with some of his followers to find the liberty which England refused him. This third phase was marked by the conviction that a true Church should be based, not on an Old Testament covenant, but on the New Testament rite of the baptism of believers, already conscious of a saving experience (1609). Thomas Helwys, a foremost friend and companion of Smyth, was led to the same conviction, and subsequently (1611–1612) returned to London to found the first Baptist Church in this country. Smyth remained in Amsterdam for the few months to his death in 1612, and his last book shows that he has penetrated beyond all that can be called sectarianism to that true Catholicism of spirit which justifies the high praise of an Anglican scholar—Mandell Creighton—'None of the English Separatists had a finer mind or a more beautiful soul.'

If we keep in mind these four phases—Puritanism, Separatism, the principle of believers' baptism, and 'Catholicism' in the sense of the universalism of Christian fellowship, we shall have a fair indication of the faith of Baptists to-day as reflected in their dominant interests and distinctive practice. The Churches which came into existence through Smyth and his followers were Arminian in their theology, and were known as 'General' Baptist Churches; other Baptist Churches arising similarly out of the Separatist movements (*e.g.* in the Jacob-Jessey Church at London, 1633–1640) were Calvinistic, and so came to be known as 'Particular' Baptists, since they confined the atoning work of Christ to the elect 'part' of mankind, instead of making it valid 'generally,' *i.e.* universally. The Particular Baptists eventually became the main body; their union with what remained of the evangelical General Baptists in 1891 showed that the division had ceased to have cogency for most Baptists. But whatever their theological colour, we may say of Baptists in general that they are Puritans who emphasize the necessity of conversion as the basis of the Church, that they are Separatists who adopt a congregational method of Church government, that they repudiate infant baptism as something not found in New Testament times, and alien to the demand of the New Testament for conscious faith (with baptism as its expression), and that the most enlightened amongst them, whatever their views on Church reunion, do recognize in practical ways their fellowship in and with the whole household of faith.

The Baptist insistence on conversion as essential

[1] His complete works, in two volumes, have been edited, with a biography, by Dr. W. T. Whitley, whose *History of British Baptists* should also be named here, as the best work on the subject.

to Church-membership (a principle found, in greater or less degree, in all the Free Churches of this country, though the baptism of infants tends, as Baptists think, to obscure it) may easily have an old-fashioned ring in modern ears. Yet contemporary study of the psychology of religion has served to bring us back to certain phenomena of religion as fundamental, and conversion, in its multitudinous varieties of form, is one of the foremost of these. The theological content, the emotional colouring, the chronological place of conversion, show the greatest variety; but both the psychological and the comparative study of religion reveal the supreme importance of this experience. If religion is to be vital, there must at some point be the conscious discovery of God by the individual consciousness, and a consequent change of attitude and life under the influence of this discovery; this is conversion, which may be sudden or gradual, intellectual or emotional, highly complex or astonishingly simple. If we make the frequent mistake of standardizing a particular type of conversion, we may easily regard it as unreal or imitative. If we forget that the ideal of a surrender to God is never completely realized, we may easily indulge in cheap cynicism about the 'converted,' and their failure to be very different from others. But the more scientific and philosophical our conception of conversion, the less we shall be inclined to make light of it as a phenomenon of religious experience. The ideal may be difficult to realize, but it is a high ideal, and not a narrow delusion. The apostle Paul lifted it above all provincialism by his striking parallel between the creative work of God in the world without, when He said, 'Let there be light,' and His creative work within the individual heart, for in Christ every man is a new creation (2 Co 5^{17}): 'it is God that said, Light shall shine out of darkness, who shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ' (*ib.* 4^{6}). Let any one who wishes to see the implications of the experience stated comprehensively read Bushnell's sermon on 'Regeneration' in the volume called *The New Life*. This is the truth of Christian experience which Baptists desire to emphasize as being of cardinal importance, and their emphasis upon it has made them, for good and for evil, the individualists in ecclesiastical theory and practice which they certainly are.

It is plain, from the history of the Free Churches, that the principle of a regenerate Church does not decide what shall be the polity of such a Church, which might be Presbyterian, Methodist, or Congregational. The third form is the simplest and loosest, and most natural to arise sporadically in the absence of central leadership. It was from the more 'Congregational' type of Puritan Separatism that Baptists emerged, of both the 'General' and the 'Particular' kind; it was natural, therefore, that they should retain the polity of local Churches, without any executive control from a central body. This method of Church organization has obvious defects; indeed, its defects are those most likely to be obvious, whilst its virtues are apt to be less in evidence. Any group of people, however incompetent, can form a Congregational or Baptist Church, and even the absence of official sanction from the union of recognized Churches does not prevent these from being all tarred with the same brush, whenever local scandal may arise, or personal animosities lead to a 'split.' On the other hand, there is great educative power in the democratic control of the affairs of a local Church, where they are taken seriously; there is something in the 'Church Meeting' of the Congregational type of polity, for which there is no equivalent in, say, Anglicanism. Whether this is, on the whole, and for present conditions, the best type of Church government, is open to debate. As a matter of fact, both Congregationalist and Baptist Churches have found it necessary, whilst retaining the ultimate independence of the local group, to take common action in matters of common interest to them respectively. There, is, however, no surrender of executive power to any central body or authority; this is always retained by the local Church, in theory, if not in practice; common action is by common consent. This jealous guarding of local liberty is characteristic of the Churches formed from the Separatists. In one respect, Baptists can claim to be pioneers. They were the first to claim *full* religious liberty, a conception to which their fellow-Separatists had not yet attained. John Smyth held that the magistrate must confine himself to civil transgressions, and must not meddle with religion at all. Thomas Helwys printed in 1612 the first assertion of this doctrine in English, frankly telling the king of England that he had no authority over a man's religion, which lay between a man and his God; even heretics, Jews or Turks, were not to be persecuted. Roger Williams carried this principle of religious liberty to America, where it was carried into practice in Rhode Island, and finally was incorporated in the constitution of the United States. In this important and now accepted principle, Baptists have led the way for their fellow-Protestants, and it is not surprising

that a passion for liberty was and is a chief characteristic of the Baptists. They fought for it in Cromwell's army, in which they took a much more prominent place than has usually been recognized. They suffered severe persecution for it through the period of the Restoration. They continued to exist through the common religious lethargy of the earlier eighteenth century into the new life of its later decades, as legally 'tolerated' religious groups. They helped to secure, in the nineteenth century, the removal of most of the remaining disabilities. To-day, their sympathies with those who still suffer under such disabilities are quickly aroused. No one can live reflectively amongst Baptists without being conscious of this passion for liberty as a leading characteristic of their type of faith (most familiarly represented in the late John Clifford). It goes back to their Separatism and the training of the local Churches in self-government and vigorous individualism.

The third characteristic feature of the life and faith of the Baptists is their distinctive practice of believers' baptism. I have ventured elsewhere [1] to suggest that in this respect Baptists are a projecting 'shelf' on the rock of the Church because the other strata have 'weathered.' It is a mistaken criticism to blame Baptists for making too much of a particular ordinance; a man made conspicuous by the withdrawal of others ought hardly to be blamed for putting himself to the front! But it is a perfectly fair criticism to ask whether the baptism of believers, or especially the ancient mode of immersion, is so important a point as to justify continued separation from other evangelical Christians because of it. We cannot meet this by any literalistic appeal to the New Testament, for we have all agreed to drop some New Testament practices. The soundest justification, on modern lines, for the retention of believers' baptism is its intrinsic value and its actual service to religious experience. Here we must distinguish the *mode* from the *subject* of baptism—the way it is administered from the kind of person to whom it is administered. As regards the mode, it is simply foolish for outsiders to suggest, as they too often do, that Baptists are pedantically antiquarian, because they stand for more water rather than less. Such remarks ignore the real value of the mode of immersion as practised in the New Testament times. This is set out in Ro 6^{1-4}, where the Apostle is gathering into the mystical unity of Christian experience three distinct sets of phenomena. The first in order of time is the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ—the historic facts which are the basis of the Christian faith. The second is the faith of the believer in this Lord, a faith which implies a conversion from the old life of moral darkness to the new life of light and liberty. The third is the actual going down of the believer into the water of baptism, and the actual rising from it, after his submersion. Paul teaches that this physical act is a kind of 'prophetic symbolism' which *does* something. It pledges the believer to that life of faith and moral regeneration which it dramatically sets forth; it identifies him with the historic Person in whom that regeneration is accomplished. The three are one in mystical unity, and it is the fitness of the symbolism of immersion which makes this fundamental unity apparent. Is it not worth while to go to some little trouble in order to proclaim such deep and permanent truths? Does not believers' baptism by immersion proclaim or 'preach' the Lord's death, like the Supper? As a matter of fact, the retention of a strongly evangelical faith amongst a community which has no common binding creed—a community, indeed, which tends to repudiate any emphasis on creeds at all—must be traced to the retention of believers' baptism itself, which is an acted creed, continually bringing before the eyes of Baptists the fundamentals of their faith, continually challenging a deeper interpretation of its own meaning, yet continually allowing for that liberty of interpretation within a common loyalty to Christ which the passion for liberty itself requires. The mode is thus of real value, because it so clearly suggests and re-enforces the truth about the subject—the person baptized. He must be a true subject, a true person, not a passive object, like the unconscious infant to which the rite is administered before personality can be said to be awakened at all. He must be a believing person, who has entered into such a relation of faith that the activities of the Holy Spirit can work through his consciousness. In this activity the rite of baptism itself can play an important part, for it is psychologically a most impressive rite. Baptists, at least, can put the greatest emphasis on the rite of baptism, without peril to an evangelical faith, for they unhesitatingly hold that it is no baptism at all unless there is evangelical faith, and that the baptism derives from the faith, and not the faith from the baptism. Yet given this true priority, the act of a quasi-physical union with the dying and rising Lord can become a means of grace of the most profound kind, and therefore a channel of the Holy Spirit. Baptists themselves have been too re-

[1] *The Life and Faith of the Baptists*, p. 78.

luctant to teach this positive side of the grace of God in baptism, owing to their reaction from 'sacramentarianism.' They have faithfully taught the relation of baptism to moral conversion and the open confession of religious faith. But the New Testament also connects baptism in water with a baptism of the Holy Spirit, *i.e.* with grace, and makes baptism the entrance into this new life of grace. I believe there is no greater contribution which Baptists could make to the Universal Church than to teach it to reunite faith and baptism, joined by God and sundered by man, to the incalculable loss of Christ's Church. But if they are to make this contribution, they must themselves learn the complementary truth about baptism which the rest of the Church has held, and Baptists have usually neglected—that baptism is the entrance into a new life of power, and of regenerated activity, through the Holy Spirit, and not simply the moral repudiation of an old life of weakness, joined to a profession of loyalty to Christ.

If Baptists have failed to realize the full catholicity of their testimony, they have not failed to make the practical application of their evangelical faith in personal evangelism and missionary service. It is their pride to have been in the forefront of modern missionary activity, through the genius and persistent patience of William Carey, who learnt from Andrew Fuller to throw off the shackles of the narrower Calvinism, and to acknowledge a duty to the whole world, too long neglected by the Church. From 1792, when the Baptist Missionary Society came into being, the missionary spirit has more and more permeated the Baptists, so that it may fairly be placed, along with the passion for liberty, as one of their marked characteristics. 'The Baptist tabernacle is not always a graceful structure, but at least we may say this of it, that the twin pillars at its door are evangelism and liberty.' [1]

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 164.

It has mainly appealed to folk in the humbler walks of life, just because of the simplicity, and often the crudity, of its presentation of these two great interests of religion, which means, of the human heart. But its world-message is apparent in the fact that the communicant membership of Baptist Churches throughout the world is now about ten millions, a number exceeded only by the somewhat larger communicant membership of all types of Methodism.

It has not seemed necessary in this brief review of the faith of the Baptists to speak of those doctrines of the faith which they hold in common with other evangelical Churches; but their close, underlying attachment to Scripture ought to be mentioned, in connexion with the appeal to Scripture as the justification for believers' baptism. This habit of reference has been educative, and has doubtless helped to keep Baptists near to the Bible. If this has issued in transient waves of 'Fundamentalism,' and provides shelter for more 'cranks' than other denominations possess, yet the price may be worth paying, for the sake of the deeper quality of Scriptural experience, which seems to me to characterize the living faith of the denomination. As one who was trained in a Congregational college, has often preached in Congregational churches, and is engaged in teaching Congregational as well as Baptist students for the ministry, I should not hesitate to say that there is a real difference between Congregationalists and Baptists, who, in Church polity, have little or no difference. Whilst Congregationalism has more culture, the Baptists seem to me to have a closer grip on the realities of the evangelical experience. This may mean simply that they are more old-fashioned; but I think it means that the retention of believers' baptism has kept them closer to some permanent truths and abiding values of the common Christian faith.

Psalm lxxxi.: A Sidelight into the Religion of North Israel.

By Professor Adam C. Welch, D.D., D.Th., New College, Edinburgh.

A difficulty which attends the study of the Psalter is the uncertainty of the date to which any psalm should be assigned. Hymns which were largely liturgical in their origin and use were naturally liable to change according to the developing religious thought and the altered religious practice of the nation. And while it is difficult to prove in any case that an individual psalm has been retouched in order to adapt it for later use, it is often impossible to ignore that it may have been. Even

psalms which preserve archaic language, and so suggest an early date, may have received later modifications, intended to make archaic usages acceptable to a later generation. For religion loves to preserve usages and phrases which are redolent of old associations, while it pours into the old words and rites fresh meaning.

Ps 81 offers one advantage to the student: it can be at least approximately dated. For it is a Psalm of North Israel. Thus it opens with a summons to praise the God of Jacob (v.[2]); and it continues by stating that the hymn was meant for use in connexion with some act which was a statute for Israel, a ritual of the God of Jacob (v.[5]), who appointed it as a testimony to Joseph (v.[6]). Israel is summoned to listen (v.[9]), and rebuked for negligence in its obedience (vv.[12. 14]). The Psalm, too, shows a preference for the Divine name Elohim. It only uses Yahweh twice in vv.[11. 16]. In v.[16] the name is doubtful: the sense would be improved if we might read there, not the opponents of Yahweh, but those of Israel (cf. B. H.). But in v.[11] the name Yahweh is employed in its strong, specific sense, for He is contrasted with the strange god of v.[10]. That is, the title is not used for the deity in general, but is reserved for the God of Israel, who claims the solitary allegiance of His people, and who has His own method of worship. Yahweh is the covenant God, who has revealed Himself to Israel.

Written in and for North Israel, the Psalm must date before 722, when that State with its public worship came to an end. It gives, therefore, a glimpse into the practice and the thought of this early period. What makes this clearer is to recognize that the Psalm was meant for the worship of the community. It is no utterance of individual piety, which might supply no more than how some devout soul thought of the worship and the God of his time. It is an official liturgy, intended for some public ceremonial and for a communal rite. Thus it opens with a summons to all present to unite in thanksgiving (v.[2]), and continues with a call to the priesthood (vv.[3. 4]). These last specially supply the full musical accompaniment, trumpet and timbrel, harp and psaltery. The occasion falls on a fixed day, the full moon or the fifteenth of the lunar month (v.[4]), and is announced by the priestly trumpet. It is definitely said to fall on the day of our *haj*, or festival (v.[4]), and can be described as something which has been prescribed to Israel (v.[5]). The hymn was written to form the liturgical accompaniment of one of the three festivals in North Israel, and reveals the attitude this community took, and the thoughts it was urged to hold, in one of its great acts of worship.

Which particular *haj* was intended is not absolutely certain. But, when Israel is bidden open its mouth wide that Yahweh may fill it (v.[11]), and when the Psalm closes with the promise that Yahweh[1] will feed the people with the finest of the wheat, it is natural to see a reference to one of the harvest festivals, either succoth or ingathering. And as ingathering, which fell at the year's end, implied, not only the final thanksgiving for the harvest of the old year, but the preparation for the ploughing before the new year began its round, it is natural to conclude that a ritual which ends on the note of a promise for the future should be connected with the close of the year.

A certain support for the reference of the Psalm to the feast of the ingathering may be found in one of the directions which appear among the headings. It is to be sung עַל־הַגִּתִּית, and this enigmatic phrase is rendered by LXX and Sym. as ὑπὲρ τῶν ληνῶν, or 'concerning the wine-presses.' That is to say, the Greek translators thought of the Psalm as resembling, or sung to the tune of, the songs sung at the grape-harvest, like those which are spoken of in Is 16^{10}, Jer 25^{30}, Jg 9^{27}.

But whether the festival was tabernacles or ingathering, it was a public and communal celebration. Then it becomes at once significant to note that the Psalm, after its summons to worship, emphasizes the peculiarly Israelite character of the rite. It belongs to Israel alone, a statute for Israel, which the God of Jacob has set to be a testimony among His people. Its *mishpat*, or ritual, must be according to Israel's peculiar practice. The whole service is to acknowledge and praise Him, and the entire conduct of it must be after His ordering. Israel is not at liberty to observe this service after its own ideas, but must follow the Divine direction. Now that is precisely the note which governs all the legislation of Deuteronomy in connexion with festival and sacrifice.[2] The code nowhere prescribes a full ritual for the observance of festival or sacrifice, first-fruits or vow. But it continually insists that everything which is done on any of these occasions must conform with the *huqqim* and *mishpatim*, the statutes and rituals which govern Israel's worship. The attitude to the cult in this North Israel psalm agrees with the outlook of the Deuteronomic code.

[1] Read וְאַבִּילֵהוּ in v.[17].

[2] Cf. especially Dt $26^{1ff.}$ in my *Code of Deuteronomy*, p. 25 ff.

But to note that the Psalm requires the community to order this part of its worship, after the prescriptions of its own religion, rouses the expectation that it may continue with further detail as to what constitutes the content of this religion. The writer, who has laid down for his primary demands that this is Israel's own festival and that it must be celebrated after Israel's own ritual, will continue to dwell on the same theme, namely, the content of the revealed religion. And that is the sense of the enigmatic clause in v.^{6c}, I hear a voice or speech which I do not know. It is the introduction of the didactic close of the Psalm (vv.$^{7-17}$). After the choral opening and the summons to praise, a single voice takes up the theme and develops it. And this voice introduces Yahweh as speaking for the guidance and instruction of the worshippers. Throughout, vv.$^{7-17}$ appear as a direct speech of Yahweh.[1] The speaker is a prophet, or at least a priest who speaks in the name and by authority of the Deity. When the Psalm represents him as hearing an unknown and mysterious voice, it is again following the Deuteronomic tradition, according to which the nation once heard the supreme message of its religion out of the midst of the fire, but saw nothing (cf. *e.g.* Dt 4^{15}). Yet the prophetic voice can be introduced in connexion with the cult, and can guide the thoughts of the worshippers at one of the public acts of their religious worship. Prophet and priest in North Israel are working together in complete amity, and are able together to serve their common religion.

The first demand which the prophet makes on the people (vv.$^{7-11}$) is extremely definite. Yahweh is the God to whom Israel owes its life and its land, since He delivered it from Egypt and brought it to Palestine. As such, He merits and ought to receive its complete allegiance: there must be no alien god within its bounds. Again, this is the fundamental religious claim in all the Book of Deuteronomy: the primary virtue in Israel is absolute allegiance to its own God. But the resemblance is not confined to ideas: it extends also into language. Thus the opening of the whole address in v.^{9} recalls at once the famous Shma Yisrael (Dt 6^{4}), and v.$^{11a.\,b}$ is practically the exordium of the Deuteronomic decalogue, 'I am Yahweh thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slaves.' Against the strange god and the foreign god of v.^{10}, Deuteronomy also issues stern warning (32^{12} 31^{16} 32^{16}). There too, 30^{19} etc., Yahweh bears witness to the people about His will (v.^{9}). And the waters of Meribah (v.^{8}) are also singled out in Dt 33^{8} as a place of some peculiar testing, which was not attended merely by failure. The North Israel psalm is closely related in ideas, language, and tradition to the Book of Deuteronomy.

In contrast with the clear demand and definite teaching of vv.$^{7-11}$, however, it is interesting to notice how vague and inconclusive the rest of the Psalm becomes. Israel has not (v.^{12}) listened to its God's voice, nor consented to Him—another Deuteronomic phrase (13^{9}). Instead it has walked after its own counsels (v.^{13}). Would that it might hearken and walk in His way (v.^{14}). But there is no effort to define what the Divine ways are, or what the Divine voice exactly demands. Nothing is said to show how and where Israel's own counsels differ from or conflict with those given by its God. The same generality of language and appeals in similar terms may be found abundantly in the parenetic sections of Deuteronomy. There is a possible reason for the lack of definiteness. Both psalmist and legislator take it for granted that their hearers know from other sources what is the precise content of the Divine will for them. That, of course, is perfectly true. But it deserves notice that in Deuteronomy the parenetic sections and allocutions with all their vagueness are allied with a code which is full of the clearest teaching about social duty. Embedded among them also is the Decalogue which sets laws about murder and theft, adultery and false witness, alongside Sabbath observance. In the Psalm the vague generalities about the Divine ways and about human wrong counsels are set down alongside very definite orders about correct methods of ritual and correct observance of outward worship. The whole emphasis becomes different. Spoken as these words were at a religious festival and at a shrine of common worship, their vagueness, after sharp, crisp statements of Yahweh's mind in connexion with the cult, was calculated to turn the minds of the worshippers in the direction of the ceremonial, rather than the moral demands of their faith. The worshipper is told with great clearness that Yahweh requires his undivided allegiance. He has been reminded that his presence at the festival was appointed as an ordinance by Yahweh. He has heard that the ritual in which he takes part must be the Israelite ritual and may not contain other elements. The natural result of the vagueness in

[1] This is an additional reason for suspecting the text of v.^{16a}. It is not natural to find Yahweh appear in the third person in a series of verses where He is otherwise the speaker.

connexion with the other demands was to make men conceive that they had fulfilled all the claims of their faith when they had observed its ceremonial. And the concluding verses were calculated to deepen this impression. For these promise that, if Israel would walk in Yahweh's ways, He should subdue its enemies under it and, in two phrases (v.[17]) which again recur in Deuteronomy ($32^{13.14}$), send it abundant prosperity.

The wholesome effect of such a liturgy depended on how its hearers construed vv.[12-14], and what elements in their faith they believed to be primary for men who gathered to the worship of the God of their fathers. Were the ways in which He required them to walk above all the ways of moral uprightness, or those of a careful ceremonial obedience? And from which of these could they conclude that He should come to their deliverance?

The Psalm gives the situation in North Israel to which Amos spoke, when he appeared at Bethel. He found men observing with extreme care all the outward forms of their religion. They were sacrificing after the ancestral fashion and were offering tithes with extreme care. And good men among them were expecting and sighing for the day of the Lord which was to crown and reward their faithfulness. Surely now Yahweh should turn His hand against their adversaries and satisfy them with all good. What Amos did was to lay a new emphasis on the meaning of the ways of Yahweh. They were the ways of moral uprightness, since Yahweh Himself was righteousness. What made Yahweh to Amos distinct from all other gods was, not that He had delivered Israel from Egypt by mere power, but that He had delivered Israel to serve His ends and fulfil His will. The two, God and people, could only walk together, if they were of one mind. And, since Israel had chosen to follow its own counsels, the two must part company and Yahweh must go in anger. Therefore the day of the Lord, for which good men sighed, must be darkness and not light.

For a long period after the conquest priest and prophet could work together, because they had a common task. Both needed to insist that the religion of their people was distinct from that of all the other nations. Yahweh must have the supreme place in His people's worship and a solitary allegiance. He must have His own altars and His own ritual, lest the people be led astray to worship Baal. But, when this was driven into the minds of Israel, the people and their priests were inclined to call a halt and be content. To the prophets like Amos there could be no halt. Why was Yahweh different? Why did He demand this distinction in His worship? What was His purpose, when He called Israel out of Egypt and made it His own?

He was different, not in name, but in character, for He was the righteous God. Therefore he could not be indifferent to the way in which He was worshipped, for righteousness can never be indifferent. And His purpose in calling Israel was to create a nation like Himself, capable of entering into His mind and willing to serve His ends. But Amos was not creating a new religion: he was demanding a moral revival. For he claimed to restore the ideals of Moses.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Are you playing the Game?[1]

'Kept back part of the price.'—Ac 5^{3}.

Run your finger round the edge of a sixpence or a shilling, and you'll feel it isn't smooth like a penny's, but all rough with any number of little ridges, as if tiny horses had been drawing a tiny plough and making tiny furrows up and down and down and up a tiny fairy field. Why is it all ridged like that? Long ago people were very poor, and some of them took to stealing. They didn't break into houses; but, whenever they got a gold or a silver coin, they took a sharp cutting thing and pared off a thin strip all round it as you peel an apple, or rather as father does, for he can do it much thinner than you. And the gold and silver they peeled off they kept until it grew into a little heap, and then they sold it. But meanwhile they were cheating the shop people. For when they bought anything, they paid for it with a coin that was supposed to be worth five shillings, or two shillings and sixpence. And yet it wasn't really, for they had kept back a part of it. And at last things got so bad that these rough edges had to be put on the coins so that, if anybody

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

tampered with them, we could know at once, and say, 'This isn't a good coin any more.' It was horrid of these people long ago to thieve and cheat like that. And yet don't we all do it even yet; don't we clip round the edges of what we say that we are giving?

Take practising. Mother told you to be sure to practise. And you promised her you would. And when she came in she said after a bit, 'Did you remember your practising?' And you said 'Yes'; and that was right. 'The whole time?' asked Mother. And you said, 'Yes; I went up at half-past three, and I stopped at a quarter-past four.' And in a way that was quite true. But didn't you clip a good bit off the coin? Are you at subtraction? Well, if you subtracted the time you wasted, would there be anything like three-quarters of an hour left really there? Nothing like it. For there was a new photo on a table. 'Who's that?' you said, and stopped to have a long look at it. Or a book was lying there you hadn't seen before. And you spent quite a while having a skim through it. That was six minutes gone before you got begun. And when you did start, you were doing beautifully when something passed along with a dreadful rattling, and you had to go to see whatever it could be. And then your eyes lighted upon your friend Sophie walking past. 'Now, what is Sophie doing here?' you said, drumming with your fingers on the window; and you had to think that out. 'Oh yes, of course, she's going to her Grannie's; she lives up that street!' 'But who's that girl with her? Oh, that will be the new girl in her class.' And then a dog came into your garden and had a look round. And, of course, you had to watch that.

Well, all that took time, took whole eleven minutes. And you kept that back. Three-quarters of an hour? No, nothing like it really.

Or, what about your prayers? I know you're sometimes dreadfully sleepy and just can't keep awake. And God knows it too. And I wonder if He likes any prayers as well as those of a wee tousley-headed soul who can't keep his eyes open, but keeps falling over. But you're not wee. You're getting big and old. And what about your prayers? How much of the time you're saying them do you really give to God; and how much do you keep back, using it, not to talk to God at all, but to think about the football match next Saturday, or about—oh, heaps of things—so many that you give very little of the time to God but keep it nearly all from Him?

Or, you know that it was God who gave you your life. Now, I want you, He said, to use this for Me; want you to be a happy little soul and make others happy, to be brave and never sulk but help others to be brave; to spend this life I'm giving you not on yourself, but for those round about you.

And yet aren't we keeping a terrible lot of it back for ourselves; and aren't we just dreadfully greedy and selfish and cross; aren't we clipping off a whole heap of it, and giving others such a teeny-weeny little bit of it? But that won't do at all. 'Show me a penny,' said Christ. 'Whose face and name are these upon it? Cæsar's? Well, give Cæsar what is his own. And now show me your life! Ah! this, I see, has got God's name and God's image stamped on it. You must give this to Him! And yet we're keeping back nearly the whole of it for ourselves! Stevenson—you know, the *Child's Garden of Verses* man, and *Treasure Island*, and *Kidnapped*—Stevenson once landed on an island in the South Seas; and the native girls all crowded round him; and he felt one of them picking his pockets and stealing his box of matches. So he asked her for a match. And she took out his own box of matches, and, with an air of being very generous indeed, gave him just one of his own matches, and put all the rest away. God has given us our life to use for Him and others round about us. And it won't do to keep it nearly all back for ourselves. That's stealing, isn't it? That isn't fair. That's lying. And we can't do that.

Consider the Lilies.[1]

'To this day, we know, the entire creation sighs and throbs with pain.'—Ro 8^{22} (Moffatt).

Perhaps some of you boys and girls have been reading in the papers of the wonderful experiments which have recently been made upon plants by a great Indian scientist, Sir Jagadis Chundra Bose. Of course, there are many wonderful things about them which we know already. We know that they breathe through their leaves; we know that they can tell the difference between heat and cold, and that they can distinguish between a sunny day and a cloudy day; we know that they have wonderful ways of digesting their food; and we know that there is at least one point in which they are far superior to ourselves and any of the other animals—while men and women, and cats and dogs and lions and tigers and fishes and insects have all got to hunt for their food, or, at least, move around looking for it, the plants and trees just sit still and gather it all in from the air and earth. You have never

[1] By the Reverend J. E. Stewart, M.A., Edinburgh.

seen a daisy hunting around the lawn for its breakfast; and yet it eats just as does the blackbird who pulls worms out of their holes by the tail, and the mavis who smashes the snail's shell on a stone. The daisy does not move an inch from where she has been all her life—but she enjoys her breakfast all the same.

Now all these things we know already. But this Hindu gentleman can tell us far more. He can tell us that plants have nerves—they can feel; he can tell us that sometimes they feel well, and sometimes they feel ill; he can tell us that they go to sleep, and waken again; and he can tell us that in the end, when they die, their death is so like our own that we can scarcely think of it without crying. Listen to some of the stories he has to tell. Some of them are—

Strange. He tells of a plant in India called the 'Praying Palm.' This is a palm which bows down when the temple bells are ringing in the evening and calling the people to prayer; it seems to be praying too. Sir Jagadis Bose explains it all by telling us that the plant is affected by the sound waves coming from the bells—it hears them; and although he would not ask us for a second to believe that it understands what the bells mean, still the effect of the sound upon that palm is the same as if it did really understand; it actually bows down, it droops, because the bells are ringing.

And then some of his stories are—

Funny. While almost all plants, like good little boys and girls, go to bed early, and sleep soundly at least until sunrise, there is one plant, the Mimosa, which keeps most disgraceful hours; it must be the black sheep of all the vegetable kingdom. He tells us—and it is horrible to think of—that very often it is two in the morning before a Mimosa is really sound asleep, and when the other plants waken at dawn it is still snoring away. It is never awake before eight, and sometimes it's nine o'clock, ten o'clock, or even midday, before it really has its eyes open!

But some of his stories are *very sad.* He describes the death of a plant. He tells us how it droops and droops, all the time getting weaker and weaker. Then suddenly there comes one awful moment when it all contracts for a second, and a kind of electric shock passes through its little body—and it's gone. The life's away, and will never come back. And that's just the way a human being dies; there is the same shock and quiver, and then the end.

The Professor was lecturing some time ago at Oxford to a very learned company. By means of a clever arrangement of microscopes and lanterns he was able to show upon a screen the actual death of a wallflower. He had poisoned the water it was in, and the audience saw the little flower struggling bravely against the poison, but all the time getting weaker and weaker. And then, just when it was at the very point of death, Sir Jagadis called out, 'Shall I let it die?' and the whole audience called back, 'No! No!' Then, amidst great excitement, he put a heart stimulant into the water which counteracted the poison, and the wallflower raised its head again, and was feeling as well as ever in a few minutes.

Is not all that a wonderful story? How much it lets us see that we never saw before; our marvellous world becomes more marvellous still after we have learned all that. But such a story should make us think too. If plants can feel like that—have we always been as kind to them as we should? We have in this country a Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals; but we will need to form another one for the Prevention of Cruelty to Plants. And that is the one I am going to ask you to join now. What are the rules for members of this society? I think I could propose one or two.

1. *Never pick a flower unless you are going to make good use of it.* Flowers are always most beautiful growing; but I think God meant us to have them in our homes too, and if we treat them well after we have picked them, we have nothing to be ashamed of. But I seem to have seen little boys and girls coming back home from their picnics with bunches of primroses and bluebells, and all those other lovely flowers we get by the roadsides and in the fields, and laying them down as soon as they get into the house, and forgetting all about them! That's cruelty to plants.

2. *Never walk along a road picking the heads off flowers, or knocking them off with a stick.* That's just murdering them, robbing them of their life, for nothing! No member of the society must ever do that.

3. *If you have plants in your house, remember to keep them watered.* Even if you have nothing but one aspidistra sitting on a table in the front window, give it the food it needs, and at the proper time; remember it's not outside, and so is unable to look after itself.

But every society must have a motto; what will our motto be? Surely we won't take long to find it, for there is only one worth thinking of at all—the three words Jesus spoke—'Consider the Lilies.' Flowers are most beautiful when we see them growing; and I am very sure Jesus did not pick one when He said that; I am very sure, too, that He was

not hitting at them with a stick as He passed. He just pointed to them all waving in the field and said 'Look.' That must be our motto, and a very beautiful one it is; none of us could propose a better.

The Christian Year.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Call from Macedonia.

'And a vision appeared to Paul in the night; There stood a man of Macedonia, and prayed him, saying, Come over into Macedonia, and help us. And after he had seen the vision, immediately we endeavoured to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering that the Lord had called us for to preach the gospel unto them.' —Ac $16^{9.10}$.

Sir William Ramsay says that these two verses form what is in many respects the most remarkable paragraph in the Acts of the Apostles. In the light of all that has happened since, we can see that this is one of the turning-points in history. Both Western civilization and Christianity spring from this hour.

1. There have been various theories about the man of Macedonia who stood and besought Paul's help. But the one that is usually accepted now is that the suppliant was the Evangelist Luke. The clue to Luke's identity is revealed in our text. We are told that when 'he,' that is, the Apostle, had seen the vision, straightway 'we,' that is, Paul and Silas and Timothy and Luke, 'sought to go forth into Macedonia, concluding that God had called us to preach the gospel unto them.' The explanation is simple when it is placed before us. Luke was a native of Philippi, a city of Macedonia, and was settled as a physician in Troas. There he met Paul, who led him to Christ. The great missionary, like all who are sensitive to the touch and the voice of God, could not fail to see a meaning in the frustration of his two proposed adventures. He and his comrades were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to speak the Word in Asia. Then, when they turned to Bithynia on the other side, the Spirit of Jesus suffered them not. Where, then, would a great door and effectual be opened to him? While he was brooding over the future, while he was dreaming and scheming about his next campaign, a vision appeared to him in the night. He saw in a flash, in one of those supreme moments of illumination that break upon pioneers and conquerors, the tremendous significance of the alliance with Luke.

Straightway the Apostle concluded that God had called him and his brethren to preach the gospel to the people of Philippi. To-morrow he would set sail for Europe. The response of Paul to the cry of that soul, athirst for the living God, was prompt and effective. Within twenty-four hours the Apostle with his three comrades in arms had started on their adventurous voyage across the Hellespont.

Some one has said that prudence is the masterstroke of the devil. At any rate the Church has often been retarded and defeated because the counsels of men who had no vision and who were superlatively endowed with caution have prevailed. Happily in this, as in every other momentous crisis in his career, the Apostle conferred not with flesh and blood. Men who prided themselves on their prudence would have stood speechless at the magnificent daring of Paul. As soon as they could recover their voice they could easily expose the folly of such an undertaking: the attempt was doomed to failure from its inception. But pessimists are always false prophets. Paul had seen another heavenly vision to which he would not be disobedient. He had heard the voice of God calling to him through human lips, and he knew by intuition and by experience that victory was assured.

Did Philippi respond to the Apostle's faith and courage? In this very chapter we have the record of three distinctly different conversions, representing three types of nationality—the Asiatic, the Greek, and the Roman—and it would be almost impossible to exaggerate the far-reaching results of this missionary journey. 'There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female: for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus.' Lydia was the first convert won in Europe. The Lord opened her heart like a flower caressed and unfolded by sunbeams. Then followed the dramatic conversion of the maid possessed with a spirit of divination. The third illustration of the power of the gospel was startling in its suddenness and its accompaniments. The Roman jailor, who a few hours ago had cast Paul and Silas into the inner prison and made their feet fast in the stocks, was roused from his sleep by an earthquake, and, trembling with fear, believed on the Lord Jesus Christ. Out of these and similar elements emerged the Church at Philippi. None of his converts were nearer and dearer to the Apostle's heart. His letter to them is an almost unbroken *Jubilate Deo*. To him they were a perennial source of gladness and strength. Many a time his heart

must have ached as he brooded over the defections of the Galatians, the heresies of the Colossians, and the sensualities of the Corinthians. But the generosity, the discernment, and the fidelity of the Philippians were always to him like an Elim in the midst of an illimitable wilderness.[1]

2. The story of how precisely Paul came to think of entering Europe with the gospel, is full of guidance for any of us who wants to make the best use of our life. There was at the back of everything his religion, and he was a missionary even before he became what he so proudly and humbly called himself, 'an ambassador for Christ.' We have our Lord's own word for it that the Pharisees would compass land and sea to make one proselyte, and Paul was a Pharisee of Pharisees. And more, he was an honest man. Christianity never changed that sound conception of life he had, namely, that we are here, all of us, to advocate and commend and advance some total view of life's meaning which we hold as most assuredly blessing life.

He must often have thought of Europe, but we have warrant for supposing that he never worried about it. A good man will do well to believe that if he holds himself ready each day to do what God wants him to do, he shall have done before he dies what God intended he should do. But we do read that, just about this time, the voice of God, as Paul would say, began to indicate Europe more precisely. And this happened in his case as it often happens with ourselves, the only difference between him and us being that we are apt not to make much of certain things that touch our souls firmly enough, but delicately. And we are too apt to say of some juncture of events which holds us up or embarrasses us that it was only accident, or it was nothing, when Paul would have said, and did say here, 'It is God.' So things began to point in a certain direction. He and his party thought of turning to the one side and going into Asia, and something seemed to hold them up. Then they decided to turn towards the other side, but there also they were forbidden, as if God had met them bodily on the highway and turned them back. They were like Foch at the first battle of the Marne, who reported to Joffre, 'My right flank is weakening, and my left flank is being turned, therefore I will'—retreat? No! therefore I will—'advance my centre with my whole force.'

That is what Paul did, and it brought him right up against the sea! Now it is not to be wondered at that, when Paul fell asleep that night to the swish of the sea, the figure of a man from the other side should appear to him, saying in effect, 'It was for my sake and for the sake of the Europe which is my home that your pathway was blocked. God has brought you to the margin of the sea, not here and now to a standstill, but to the edge and moment of a new venture.'

May it not be that, by the very embarrassments of our life, and of our best life in all directions just now in these old countries, we are being directed, and indeed compelled, by God to take our eyes as much as may be away from ourselves, and to take up, as we have never yet taken up, the task of unifying the whole world with the mind of Jesus Christ concerning God and man and duty? We know that, had Paul refused to launch out, there is a fair chance that the Christian movement might have turned back upon itself, and might for ages have been lost in orientalism and futility.

We do know that, by setting out, St. Paul brought the saving salt to Europe; and in saving Europe, saved Christianity, for he liberated its genius.

If we were all of us only quiet enough and believing enough, feeling as we ought to feel how hot and angry and difficult life in its fairer forms is becoming amongst ourselves; and on the other hand, as we look abroad, if we could see the strange silences, the sinister groupings of the nations, the mounting possibilities which, unless God hinder them from maturing, might even now overwhelm the world—if we considered these things soberly and bravely, seeking guidance, we should awake with a new light in our eye, and something fresh in our voice; for something would have come to us, which, in its deep and permanent principles, was the very thing which came to Paul at Troas, a voice calling to him from lands beyond the sea.[2]

[1] W. Wakinshaw, *The Headsprings of Life*, 164.

[2] J. A. Hutton, *The Victory over Victory*, 187.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Eternity in the Heart.

'He hath made every thing beautiful in his time: also he hath set the world [eternity] in their heart.'—Ec 3^{11} (R.V. marg.).

The Book of Ecclesiastes is curiously mixed. Here is cynicism as of a man who has seen many dreams turn to vanity. There, again, is gratitude as of a man who has known the goodness of Providence. Once more, we discover an element of shrewd and tried wisdom which well knows the virtues that are likely to endure through all entanglement. But the greatest thing in the book is not its

cynicism, its thankfulness, its joy, or its wisdom. Rather is it the appalling riddle which it leaves over the scroll like a huge note of interrogation—What is the chief good? What is the core of life's meaning? And nowhere does he write the question more boldly than here. 'He hath made every thing beautiful in its time: also he hath set "eternity" (not "the world") in their heart.' There you have it. Life and its prodigality of gifts, its glorious landscapes and shining seas, its ordered seasons and ceaseless flow, its rich capacities and Divine hopes, its temptations and its pleasures; and at the heart of all the unfathomed deep, not an accident or an illusion, not a phase of feeling which a less credulous age may outlive, not a cloud of mystery which the years may blow away, but a quality, an element set there in the midst of life by the hand of God. 'Thou hast set eternity in its heart.'

A wide range may be given to this central fact of existence, and we may assert that it dominates Nature, the life of the race, and the individual soul.

1. Is there not a sense in which the eternal lies at the heart of Nature? Recall the vision of the perfect glory of a summer day—the cloudless sky, the fair landscape, the bloom of flowers, the song of birds, and in the distance a glimpse of the cool gleaming sea. A vision of perfect beauty; but is it also a vision of perfect content? Does not its perfectness lie in this, that it is never captured? There is something that eludes us, that something of which Wordsworth was the triumphant modern interpreter. The shimmer of beauty over a great sea, the round of the seasons, with their unending process of resurrection, death, and resurrection once more, hint at great things lying very near to the heart of Nature. We do not really understand Nature until we surmise the presence of something eternal, of which Nature is but a fleeting symbol.

2. God has dowered the races, we say, each with its own peculiar genius. To Greece He gave the genius of philosophy and art. Greece became a supreme type of the 'brooding East.' To Rome was given the genius of empire and of law. To the Teutonic peoples came the gifts of the practical and pragmatic mind. But there was another race, materially of small account, which God set among the nations, a race distinguished above all others by its instinct for religion, its passion for moral righteousness, its sense of the eternal. The Hebrew people of all nations bore most clearly the signature of the eternal. It is said of Greece, by way of contrast with Judea, that 'it made earth a home, ordered and well equipped for the race; it supplied the lacking elements—art, science, secular poetry, philosophy, political life, social intercourse.' All that we may admit with endless gratitude, yet we must maintain that the supreme good—the heart amid all this diversity of gifts—came along the track of Hebrew religion, which Christ carried to its summit and transfigured in His own Person. God set the eternal among the nations, that they might be swayed from one centre and swept on to a common destiny. So the poet is not far wrong when he sings:

Thus the sharp contrasts of the Sculptor's Plan
Showed the two primal paths our race has trod,
Hellas the nurse of man complete as man,
Judea pregnant with the living God.

3. Nature and history lead us to man. This is the final truth. He hath set the eternal in the human heart. What a miraculous thing is this nature of ours! And how splendid were it not for the invasion and entanglement and ruin of sin! What a galaxy of powers, what a republic of forces in the least conspicuous of us! The mind itself is a world of wonder in its most ordinary processes, in its simplest thought. That majestic faculty we call conscience—judge, prophet, and king in one—'had it might as it has right, it would absolutely govern the world.' The love that suffers for love's sake, that can pass through fire and flood and be unquenchable in death, the imagination which banishes distance and defies the dark, and gathers light like sheaves from distant worlds—these are Divine things. Yet there is something more. 'Take the charm "for ever" from them and they crumble into dust.' This is the something more. 'He hath set the eternal in our heart.' Here is the tremendous significance of our life, its unimaginable peril no less than its glory and security. We are part not of a world of shadows, but of a world of everlasting fact. The touch of God's hand, the witness of our origin, lies deep in our being. It is futile to attempt to read human life, its sin or its virtue, its obloquy or glory, without this clue.

If this is so, then it seems to yield us three clear morals:

(1) The utter folly of ordering human life along purely secular lines. *Vanitas vanitatum*—it is the inevitable comment on the limited material view. Gibbon speaks of a Saracen commander to whom had come wealth and pleasure, power and splendour, who yet confessed that out of fifty years he could count but fourteen days of genuine happiness. Had the standard been higher, even the fourteen might have been wiped out. The soul that has the touch

of the eternal on it must remain unsatisfied till the Eternal God comes in.

(2) The pitiful mistake of sin. Sin never, in this life or in any other, can satisfy. It corrodes and debases and exhausts. It leaves only more terrible the unfathomable void. Sin is all negation and defect, incalculable defect, whereas goodness is all gain, incalculable gain.

(3) The extraordinary and complete mercy of God, as shown to us in the perfect fitness of Jesus to be the Saviour of our strange complex life. If God hath set the eternal in the heart of all that He has made, then the eternal itself has an innermost heart. And that heart is Christ. He makes the seen and the unseen one. He bridges the gulf between a world that is passing and a world of abiding reality. The infinite would be a yawning blackness if when we encountered it Christ did not fill it with His glory. Even the dream of immortality might become a torment if there were no Christ. But Christ abideth, bone of our bone, kind, forgiving, eternal. With His eyes we see the glad sunshine, not of this world alone, for He it is who has brought us near to God and enabled us to see that He who has made everything beautiful in its time is Himself Eternal Beauty, Eternal Goodness, and Eternal Life.[1]

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Friendship of Christ.

'I have called you friends.'—Jn 15^{15}.

1. *What the Friendship of Christ means.*—The tragedy of personality is its loneliness; the more personality is developed, the more this essential loneliness is felt. Deep down that is the cause of man's unrest, his intolerable loneliness, which nowhere can he get relieved. It is as if the soul of man were only half a personality, or twin born, and its twin lost or dead.

And the tragedy is often only intensified in the search for its mate. Some temperaments find their refuge in a crowd of acquaintances in whose collective presence one seems at last to be alive; but all such crowds must disperse, and there follows the inevitable reaction. It is the modern substitute for religious fellowship to spend a great deal of time in conferences with kindred spirits; and in these conferences great spiritual impulses are born and high vision vouchsafed; but their general effect is debilitating; for, when the conference separates, it is often found that there is a reaction of depression to be faced. Other temperaments seek for satisfaction in the worship of the crowd. This is the lure of politics, and often, it is to be feared, the false ambition of preaching. Others seek completion in a few choice friends or in some one beloved soul. But for the few that find the one real friend there are many who come out of the search not only disappointed but disillusioned.

For the truth is that human personality is impermeable to its own kind, and its secrets remain incommunicable to any other. What is wanted is some more spiritual personality; some vision which sees everything at a flash, so that there is no uncomfortable progression of painful self-revelation to go through; and yet a personality of such peculiar moral construction that while it will not approve anything that is evil and bad, yet neither will it be repelled nor its friendship destroyed by what it sees. In the presence of such a friend one could find rest because one could be oneself, since it would be no use being anything else. One could talk or be silent at choice. This is a demand for God, and for a friendly God.

It is precisely to fulfil this need of friendship that the Incarnation took place.

We want the Divine if we are going to have perfect vision, perfect penetration of soul; but, if we are going to have perfect confidence and joy upon our side, we want the human too. But bare combination of God and man, as historical Person and eternal Spirit, would provide neither the warmth nor attractiveness that we need. Now the life of Jesus is simply a living out in unmistakable plainness of the great friendship of God for us. There is first His own craving for friendship. It would be nothing to us if our Divine friend simply gave all to us and seemed not to need us in return. With all the resources of His own character and His unbroken communion with His Father, Jesus obviously craved human friendship. And when He gathers round Him a bodyguard, to whom He commits the preaching of the gospel and the building up of the Church, His last great name for them is neither disciples nor apostles, but friends. Let it never be forgotten that the foundation of the Catholic and Apostolic Church is a Society of Friends, the company of Jesus.

Could there be any more convincing revelation that, for whosoever needs it, God in Christ is set forth as furnished with every capacity for being man's Friend? And to crown all with evidence written in blood, in accordance with words which have their perfect application to Himself alone: 'Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay

[1] A. Connell, *The Endless Quest*, 227.

down his life for his friends.' And both by character and deed, by strange overmastering attractiveness and still stranger sense of affinity, Jesus Christ has vindicated Himself across the spaces of history and beyond the differences of race and culture to have infinite capacity for befriending the sons of men. Like all friendship, it has something mysterious about it; it springs up suddenly or grows through years of mere acquaintance into intimate love; at first repelled, and only won after a long fight with oneself, and with many struggles with the competing friendship of the world it at last overpowers. With others it is just love at first sight and love for ever.

2. Why do so few advance to real Friendship with Jesus?—Some do not because they are not ripe for it.

There are some who have never sought the friendship of Jesus because they have not yet come to that stage where they are conscious of the need of friendship. In matters of the soul some are still back in the completely socialized stage; for such persons, with differing temperament, the crowd, patriotism, or the Church is respectively sufficient. For even in religion one can go a long way in Christianity and yet fall short of the stage where Jesus is known after this intimate fashion. There are souls who are willing to obey Christ, who rejoice in the fact of the Incarnation, who live within the circle of the Church, which is, after all, kept wide open by the spirit of friendship which Jesus inspired, and who yet have never known Him thus closely as a personal friend.

But there are some who seem ready and yet seem to miss it.

The teaching of the passage from which our text is taken probably throws some light upon this more difficult problem. Jesus does distinctly state that the position of friendship is one that supervenes upon others: 'Ye are my friends if ye do the things which I command you.' There must be a willingness for ethical obedience. Sometimes in human friendship we observe something like real friendship between characters who are morally opposed. No such friendship is possible with Jesus. The Lord declares that the call to friendship succeeds to a relationship which is more accurately described as that of servant. He seems to assume that that has a rightful place, that there is a novitiate for friendship, in which one is first nothing but servant.

But even when, so far as we can tell, all conditions have been fulfilled, there often remains a lack of realization. Jesus is not to some souls what He is to others, and what He is assuredly willing to be to all. There is a lack of any sense that He is as available as an ordinary friend. Or He does not relieve, as one might expect, some particular experience of frustrated love or isolated life. Yet there is sufficient evidence in great souls, who had to pass lonely through life and yet found Jesus give all that human friendship could give, to convince us that it is due to no lack in Him and to no circumstances, however hard and bitter, that life can create. Think of Paul, whose experience here has been so finely characterized by F. W. H. Myers:

> Lone on the land and homeless on the water
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Yet not in solitude if Christ anear me.

Think of Livingstone, lost in the vast forests of Central Africa, keeping on his lonely way, murmuring, 'Jesu dulcis memoria.' Think of Newman's over-sensitive and unbefriended soul, cut off from the companions and co-workers of his earlier days, yet finding in Jesus his friend. Then what do some of these awakened but unsatisfied souls miss? Perhaps it is that they are unable to believe that a friendship which is shared can be enough. They want a lover all to themselves; they cannot be content with the Lover of men who has to distribute His affection over the vast numbers of the souls He died to save. This incorporates a selfishness into the demand of love which prohibits its satisfaction. Perhaps it is that they are trying to keep friends with the world; they have lost their hearts to pleasure, fame, riches, or power. No such divided heart can ever know what the friendship of Christ really means.

What may ease and release them all is to set forth what the friendship of Christ means.

It means an ever-present friendship. One does not always feel that He is near, or always remember. He is not one of those friends who soon tire us out by continually thrusting themselves upon us. But when we want Him He is always there. It is not a friendship which can exist only so long as there is conversation going. Sometimes the heart burns and overflows with love and devotion; but if one wants to be quiet, He will consent to remain with us and walk by our side there; and that is enough. That is particularly the sort of presence that the Sacrament seems to bestow. One does not need to pray, but just to rest and be still in the calm serenity of His nearness. But there is a welcome sign of His being ever present in that the presence is never withdrawn when true friendship has once been established. He is not easily put off by the

humours which cloud our devotion, nor does He leave it all to us to make up again when we have done something that would have offended an ordinary friend. He comes to seek us out. He begins the re-establishment of friendship, as He did with Peter after His great denial. One has the rest of knowing that if we prove faithless He remains faithful.

It means a fruitful friendship. There are some friends with whom intercourse proves at length wearisome because they really contribute nothing; some friendships which we grow out of, because we have grown while our friends remain the same. But the friendship of Jesus offers us the constant stimulus of His stirring and cheering mind. When one lives in the gospel story one finds that one is in contact with a mind which is ever new, and with a character which has the effect of continually bracing and elevating our own.

It means a very tender friendship. No words can reveal to another the intimate secrets of the friendship Jesus brings. 'The love of Jesus what it is, none but His loved ones know.' But what constitutes that tenderness and what brings out all the devotion and loyalty, the gratitude and endless romance of it, is the fact that He laid down His life for His friends. And so whenever we think of Him there He stands, and there comes to our eyes a light, and to our faces a smile, and to our lips a song. And what joy to be able to introduce Him to others, 'This is my Beloved, and this is my Friend.'[1]

Seventh Sunday after Trinity.

Death or Life?

'For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.'—Ro 6^{23}.

Paul condenses his high argument on the interaction of the wrath and the grace of God into this brief sentence. It holds three affirmations. The first is that the enmity and mutiny of sin receive the penalty of death as justly and deservedly as a labourer receives his wage for the work he has done. The second is that the pulsing spiritual energy of eternal life is the gift of God in and through Jesus Christ. The third is that every man must face these two alternatives.

1. '*The wages of sin is death.*'—What is death? Like life it remains, in the last analysis, a mystery, but the proofs and evidences of it are clear and definite. The signs of physical death have a certain similarity to those of spiritual death, although the one is a swifter, subtler, and more awful experience than the other. Physical death is recognized by the failure of the organism to fulfil its functions. The brain becomes torpid: the heart stops. The second evidence is the insensibility which can make no response to any stimulus from the outer world. Then there is the final and unmistakable proof—corruption. So in spiritual death this failure of the functions of the soul, this absence of response to the appeal of a spiritual world, and at last a moral corruption make up its sure signs. These are the wages of death.

Let us mark the history of this penalty. Consider, to begin with, the instancy of death. Death passes upon the soul in the very act of sin. God does pay wages in the hour in which they are earned. We all know how instantly the sentence of death passes in the moment when the passion is sated. It is, as our poet says:

> A bliss in proof, . . . and proved, a very woe.

In the moment of sin death passes upon the innocence and heart's-ease of the soul. The pure and wistful thought is stricken, and even the honest look in the eyes has gone. In the Old Testament story, with its inspired insight, we are told that in the moment when the forbidden fruit was eaten 'the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked.' So, always, death passes upon the virgin purity, and stifles the holy desires of the soul. Like a touch of frost on the flowers of the garden, the tender and living simplicities of the soul are dead. A little child spends an hour in a picture palace where deeds of vicious purpose are disclosed, a youth looks into a forbidden scene of revelry, a man yields, for the first time, to a haunting temptation—in the instant death shoots through the soul.

Mark, again, the sequences in death. This first touch of death, in which innocence and shame and pure feeling have been withered, is followed by a more penetrating deadliness over a widening area. The first sin is like the first speck of rottenness in the peach. It spreads. For death goes on to assail all the sweet relationships of life. You can never be the same son, the same brother, the same husband or wife, the same father or mother after you have sinned against these loyalties. The bloom of the heart has been despoiled. The romance of life is gone. Something has come between you and all life's sweetest intimacies, and that something is a withered faculty touched by death.

This sequence of death continues its course. It

[1] W. E. Orchard, *The Safest Mind Cure*, 20.

assails all Nature, but there is one sphere where sin's penalty is sadly evident. That is in the body. The loathsome sore that will not heal, the manifest corruption in the blood, the shattered nerve are all part of the wages of death. These are not the scars which honest toil and self-sacrificing strain have marked upon a man's features and frame. No, these are the tokens of the conquests of death. The people in the wilderness loathed the manna and craved for flesh to eat. They murmured in a wilful rebellion. God gave them their request. The quails fell in abundance round the camp, and the people gorged themselves with their flesh. Then the plague arose and the camp became an arena of death. The name of the place was called Kibroth Hataavah—the graves of lust. Wherever there is a lust there is a grave.

The penalty of death has issues and consequences beyond the sinner himself. It passes out to others, often to his dearest. A little child's faith and reverence have been slain by the self-indulgence, the foul jest, the angry temper of those who were its guides. The home that should have been a sanctuary is a place where all aspiration dies at its birth. There are graves which men dare not visit, for the dead who lie in them yet speak in condemnation of the self-will and passion of those who can never forget their green mounds. And, if you will but think of it, you will see that this penalty of death passed out from sinful humanity until at last it smote Him who knew no sin and nailed Him to His cross.

Then mark the final issue of death. That is its dominion in the soul. 'Sin,' writes James, 'when it is finished bringeth forth death.' He is thinking of sin as though it were born a feeble and undeveloped child coming to its maturity and then giving birth to death—the death of the soul. For what is the last issue of death but to lose the power to hope in God and to have the old relentings and repentings of younger years? The man who once longed to be holy, who knew that righteousness and peace and joy were the supreme felicities of life, who had been on the brink of a complete surrender may close his life in a spiritual torpor. And here we see the decisive proof of death. It is not the failure of the functions of the soul. It is not the lack of response to the call of Christ. It is corruption. When, then, the soul has become so corrupt that it can plunge into moral slime without a qualm, and can play the glutton with evil, and wipe its lips and say, 'I have done no harm,' the full wages of sin has been paid. Shakespeare draws his corrupt soul in Iago, whom neither innocence, nor honour, nor trust, nor love will move:

When devils will the blackest sins put on,
They do suggest at first with heavenly shows,
As I do now;
. . . . . .
So will I turn her virtue into pitch,
And out of her own goodness make the net
That shall enmesh them all.

Then the soul dwells in silence, and there is no silence like that of death.

2. '*The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.*'—Life is always a gift. The seed which was cast into the ground will burst, and its green blade will appear. How, its sower knows not. The life is a gift. A little child was born this morning. His mother heard his infant cry with a catch in her heart. She marked his soft breathing and found it music. Whence came that pulsing, breathing life? Life is a gift. A man was born again to-day. He had been drifting into ways of rebellion. He had ceased to feel the goad in his conscience. He had forgotten how to pray. Then a word, a child's voice, a woman's appeal, a bereavement awoke him. He was touched to the quick, and moved to penitence and trust. How? He cannot tell. Eternal life is the gift of God. 'Through Jesus Christ our Lord'—that is the indispensable condition. Shall we say that there was no spiritual life before Christ came, and that men who sought after God did not find Him? Surely there was life, but it was not 'life in Christ' with its experiences and its potencies. The certainty and fact of eternal life in Christ can be realized in this way. We cannot say that the men who knew the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob had not received the gift of life. We cannot say that millions, of whom Abraham was ignorant, have not been quickened by this gift. But it is a great gift of God to live after our Lord. Life in Christ is a visitation such as the old Hebrew times never knew. Had Abraham, ascending his green hill, Moriah, found the cross uplifted on its summit; or had Moses, on the mountain-top, looked into the transfigured face of the Son of God; or had David lifted his eyes of shame, not to Nathan, with his rebuke, but to Christ, with His look, what a gate of new life would have been opened before them all! Abraham would have made no sacrifice. Moses would have summed up his commandments in one great call to love. David would have fallen down to kiss Christ's feet and wet them with his tears. A new light would have

shone within their minds, a new peace been given to their consciences, and an uprush of crucified desires would have found expression in their lives.

3. Now every man is either in the way of death, or the way of life. St. Paul sets these two truths down as alternatives, and there are only two. Every man is passing on either through the sequences of death or the sequences of life. Tender and sensitive minds have shrunk from accepting this stern truth, but we cannot accept, even to escape our saddening thoughts, the teaching that the immortality of the soul is an illusion. Rather, with Martineau, it is true 'nothing human ever dies.' What Paul says is not that men have life, but that they have eternal life in Christ. Immortal existence that cannot be quenched is not eternal life. Life without Christ is possible here. Life without Christ is possible hereafter. Eternal life in this world and in every other world must be the gift of God. There are, therefore, the two alternatives—death or life. If a man will pass on in his own self-willed, headstrong way, if he will refuse to yield up his soul and his life to God, if he will disdain to accept that new principle and transforming energy which Christ alone can give, he will, in the moment of his refusal, enter the shadow of death, and he will find it deepening its darkness until the light is gone.

There is a season on the earth when the year is at the spring, and life comes down upon it out of heaven from God. There is also a season in the experience of the soul. That season is at hand when a man is discovered to himself by the power of the Holy Spirit; and a new craving for fellowship with God, and a new desire to walk with Christ in the strength of truth and purity, awaken within the soul.[1]

[1] W. M. Clow, *The Evangel of the Strait Gate*, 69.

Contributions and Comments.

Ἐπιστρέφω (Luke xxii. 32).

Your readers will be grateful to Mr. Lee (February issue of The Expository Times) for the ingenious rendering that he suggests of *καὶ σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας, στήριξον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου*—'and you, when you have converted your brothers, strengthen them.' But one fears that it is more ingenious than accurate. For, is not *ἐπιστρέφω* to be taken as intransitive—as in Mt 13^{15}, *καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσι*; Mk 4^{12}, *μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσι*; Ac 13^{19}, *μετανοήσατε οὖν καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε*; Ac 28^{21}, *καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσι*—which clauses respectively Moffatt renders thus: 'and turn again'; 'lest they turn'; 'repent, then, and turn'; 'and turn again'? On what authority Moffatt forsakes his 'turn' rendering in what seems to be a parallel text (Lk 22^{32})—taking *ἐπιστρέψας* in a mere adverbial sense—one would like to know.

The view that *ἐπιστρέφω* is intransitive in the text before us is further strengthened by reference to Ac 3^{19} 9^{35} 11^{21} 14^{15} 15^{19} 26^{20}, 2 P 2^{21}.

Taking all this into account, and reflecting that the immediate context, 'I have prayed that your faith may not fail,' implies that what follows is to be taken in an ethical or moral sense, I humbly suggest for the clause under review the rendering, '*And you, when once you actually reform, be a strength to your brothers.*'

P. Thomson.

Dunning.

'A Scorpion for an Egg' (Luke xi. 12).

The point of our Lord's illustration is that it is an unnatural and unusual thing for fathers to deceive their children. No decent father would offer his child a harmful thing—a serpent—if he asked a fish; or a useless thing—a stone—if he asked a loaf. A child might easily be thus deceived. For there is a resemblance between fish and serpents, and stones rounded by the action of water might be mistaken for loaves of a certain make. But is there any remote resemblance between eggs and scorpions? Thomson's suggestion, in *The Land and the Book*, namely, that a white scorpion with its tail tucked in might look like a small egg, is rejected by Hastings' *D.C.G.* as 'unsatisfactory.'

I have more than once seen the following trick played by an Indian conjurer, which may possibly offer a clue. The conjurer takes from amongst his properties some small article (it might easily be an egg) and closes his hand upon it. He then offers

it to one of his audience, usually a child, to hold. The child holds out his hand and the conjurer places upon it, not the article you are expecting to see, but—a live scorpion! Of course, the beast has been rendered harmless by the removal of its sting, but the recipient gets a shock and drops it as though it were red-hot!

May it not be possible that our Lord and His hearers had seen some such trick performed? The obvious 'humour' of the whole saying would be heightened by this supposition.

HERBERT PEGG.

Margate.

Matthew v. 18.

THIS verse, which seems to assert the permanence even of the minute details of the Jewish Law, contradicts the whole tenor of the following verses. That Jesus came to fulfil the Law we may readily grant. His function was to disengage its intrinsic significance, and carry to perfection the principles embodied in it. As Stevens says, Jesus fulfils the Old Testament system by rounding out into complete perfection all that is essential. But v.[18], which seems to give permanence to every jot and tittle, is incredible on the lips of Jesus. If such a saying had been known to the disciples, could there have been any possibility of acceptance for Paul's views?

Beyschlag thought that the verse was attested by Lk 16[17]. The parallel provides us with a clue. The plain meaning of the Lucan passage, which does not seem to have been recognized, is ironical. 'The law and the prophets were until John: from that time the gospel of the kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it. But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one tittle of the law to fall.' In other words: the Law has actually been superseded by the gospel, but no peaceful transition seems possible; we may expect the universe to dissolve before the Jews will concede a single letter.

The hyperbole is quite in the manner of Jesus; but if the irony was missed, the saying might easily be perverted to the form in which it appears in Matthew. It might even be used by those Jewish Christians who sought the authority of Jesus for the anti-Pauline position. But it was an illegitimate wresting of an ironical phrase, and stripped of its irony it appears nakedly inconsistent with the whole teaching of Christ.

J. CONNOR.

Fairfield, Manchester.

James ii. 1.

I.

THE interesting suggestion of the Rev. T. Nicklin in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of April is the latest of many attempts to solve the problem of Ja 2[1]. Another solution, which has perhaps not received the attention it deserves, is that of Dr. J. H. Moulton, to be found in the *Expositor* of July 1907. He regards the words ἡμων Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as a later insertion, made when an Epistle, originally written for Palestinian Jews, was to be more widely circulated. This may seem a heroic remedy and a cutting of the Gordian knot. But there is much to be said for it. It makes clear an obscure passage in a document the Greek of which elsewhere is remarkably straightforward and free from ambiguity. The context of the verse suggests that the συναγωγή in question was Jewish, not Christian. The word συναγωγή is not used for a *Christian* place of meeting till much later than the time of James. And in those early days the Christians had no separate buildings for worship. They celebrated their Eucharist κατ' οἶκον (Ac 2[46]). (Moulton, by the bye, in common with some other scholars, regards the Epistle as being addressed to the writer's [Palestinian] fellow-countrymen generally [ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς, 1[1]], and not to *Christian* Jews only.) Professor Burkitt has, in his *Christian Beginnings* (p. 69 f.), given us excellent reasons for thinking that the Epistle of James, as we have it, is a not very literal translation into idiomatic Greek of an original Aramaic letter, and that it was made after the destruction of Jerusalem by some one in Aelia Capitolina, where St. James was held in special honour. In that case it is easy to see why the translator, in order to adapt it to a wider audience, added ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ, and καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in 1[1] and Χριστοῦ in 2[1]. He wished to give the revised Epistle a more definitely Christian tone.

H. W. FULFORD.

Cambridge.

II.

It is worth while to examine some of the versions. Vulgate does not help us, being a literal rendering of the Greek 'Nolite . . . habere fidem Domini nostri Jesu Christi gloriæ.' But Syr. Pesh. interprets: 'My brethren, do not be in respect of persons holding to the faith of glory (glorious faith) of our Lord Jesus Christ.' The Arabic, however, attaches the τῆς δόξης to the Lord Himself: 'O my brethren, let there not be to you faith of our

Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, in partiality.' This latter rendering supports the exegesis proposed by Mr. T. Nicklin in the April number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. In Ac 4^{33} the Arabic has 'were bearing witness as to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus,' and is supported by the Syriac.

E. G. NORRIS.

Faringdon.

1 Peter iii. 19.

THE variant reading in this passage of some MSS., ἐν ᾧ Ἐνώχ καὶ . . . κτλ., for the textual ἐν ᾧ καὶ . . . κτλ., proposed by Dr. Rendel Harris, has met with wide acceptance among N.T. scholars. How the word Ἐνώχ came to be omitted is not obscure. Dittography and its opposite (as here) are well-known errors in transliteration.

There is, however, another variant MS. reading, ἐν ᾧ Νῶε καὶ . . . κτλ., which is worthy of consideration, but has not, so far as I am aware, been advanced. Here also the same error in transcription would lead to the omission of the word Νῶε.

Each reading appears to be supported by equal MS. authority, and the context must be taken into account in considering their respective merits.

The Apostle declares (T.R. v.[17]) that it is 'better to suffer, if the will of God so decree, for well-doing than for evil-doing. Because (v.[18]) Christ also once suffered for sins, just for unjust, that He might lead us to God, having been put to death as to the flesh indeed, but quickened to life in the spirit, in which (v.[19]) also He went and preached to the spirits in prison, who (v.[20]) were aforetime disobedient when the long-suffering of God was waiting in the days of Noah while the ark was a-preparing.'

The subject-matter is the just unjustly suffering opprobrium, as the Christians to whom Peter is writing were now suffering, and as their Great Exemplar had once likewise suffered. They were, says the Apostle in effect, to accept such sufferings in His spirit, 'who, when he was reviled, reviled not again.'

We should expect accordingly in the following verse (v.[20]) to find the Apostle in the development of his theme introducing as an example of this spirit of Christ some well-known just person (or persons) who, 'doing justly,' had suffered wrongfully. Scripture (Gn 6^{19} LXX) describes Noah as 'just' (δίκαιος), 'perfect (τέλειος) in his generation' and 'well pleasing (εὐηρέστησε) to God.' It is not, indeed, expressly stated in Scripture—though Jewish tradition points that way—that Noah suffered contumely from the evil and 'disobedient' of his age 'while the ark was a-preparing.' But in the parallel Chaldæan Epic of the Flood, Xisuthros, who there takes the place of Noah, is stated to have been mocked and jeered at while building the ark or ship. And it can scarcely be doubted that one so just and upright as the patriarch is recorded to have been would meet with contumely at the hands of a generation that 'filled the land with injustice' and deeds of violence; or, that he would refrain from uttering words of warning respecting the doom that God had told him (Gn 6^{13}) He would bring upon those evil-doers who 'sinned with a high hand,' living in fancied security until the flood came upon them (cf. Mt $24^{37.38}$, Lk $17^{26.27}$, where our Lord compares 'the days of Noah' with 'the coming of the Son of Man').

'God,' as Paul affirms, 'hath at no time left himself without a testimony' to His loving kindness and long-suffering towards mankind, and Scripture would appear to indicate Noah as the one above others who, in the days preceding the Flood, bore faithful testimony (He 11^{17}, 'condemning the world') to Him 'while the long-suffering of God was awaiting' man's repentance.

I would accordingly translate the passage (vv.[19.20]), 'And in such wise (in the spirit of Christ) Noah also went (as His herald) and proclaimed (ἐκήρυξεν) God's message (Gn 6^{13}) to the souls living in (fancied) security (φυλακὴ has this meaning of 'security') who were aforetime disobedient (to that message)[1] when the long-suffering of God was awaiting, while the ark was being prepared.'

Such a rendering would not be burdened with the admitted difficulties attaching to the sudden interjection of the preaching (of the Gospel) by our Lord, or by Enoch, to the 'imprisoned spirits' of those who perished in the Flood. Why to them only, and not to the denizens of the whole 'underworld'? is but one of these difficulties.

W. D. MORRIS.

Kelso.

[1] Or 'souls now in ward' (cf. τηρουμένους, 2 P 2^{4}).

'Greater Things than These.'

By the Reverend John Lendrum, M.A., Elgin.

'Greater things than these'—the words have a familiar sound to our ears. And the reason is that they occur no fewer than three times within the Fourth Gospel (Jn 1^{50} 5^{20} 14^{12}). And if, according to the scant records we possess, the words fell thus often from the lips of Jesus, they may fairly be taken as representing a thought that was often with Him, and something dominant in His attitude and outlook. Jesus, these words suggest, had a forward-looking mind. He was never content with things as they were, but always looked for something better. However good the things that came down out of the past might be, there were yet to come things better and greater. God has done great things? Yes, says Jesus; but He will yet do greater. God has given much? He will yet give more—much more. Do not rest or settle down in things present, as if these were the best you were ever to get or the utmost God was ever to give. God is never done giving, and what He has given already is but a beginning. Fear not, therefore; only believe. Ask, and ask great things; expect great things from God; look always for greater things. Never cease to hope, but live rather in an attitude of expectancy.

I.

'Thou shalt see greater things than these,' said Jesus to Nathanael at their first meeting (Jn 1^{50}). Jesus, who knew what was in man, read the heart of the man as an open book, and Nathanael was so astonished at His swift and penetrating insight, that at once he surrendered and believed. It was not faith of the highest order, but, such as it was, Jesus accepted it; and forthwith sought to encourage and increase it by glowing words of promise. Nathanael had seen a great thing? What he had seen, declared Jesus, was as nothing compared with what he would see. He had seen a miracle of insight; if he held by Jesus, he would see far more than that—many and great miracles of power. He would see Jesus healing the sick, curing the lame, giving sight to the blind; would see Him as One in whom God was present to heal and save, as One who acted between heaven and earth, angels ascending from Him to tell the needs of man, angels descending to Him with the power of God. Or, perhaps, since Jesus never made much of His miracles of healing, what He meant was that Nathanael would yet see Him not merely winning over humble, pious souls like himself, but laying hold of common sinners and making new men of them—seeking out and saving the lost. Or He may have meant more even than that. Nathanael had seen in Jesus the Messiah, the King of Israel; but, if he would but follow Him, he would come to see in Him far more than that—not merely the Messiah of the prophets, but the Son of God, the Saviour of the world, the one Mediator between heaven and earth, with one hand touching God, with the other touching man, and so bringing them together. All that Nathanael in his hours of mystical communing had felt after or dreamt of—all that, and far more than that, he would yet find in Jesus: a sure Word from God, a ladder between heaven and earth, a Way to the Father.

And here, indeed, we have one of the most amazing and most satisfying things about Jesus Christ. From the beginning we find great things in Him; yet, as we company with Him, we discover greater things still. Always we are finding new meaning in His words, new beauty in His character, new glory in His grace. He never palls upon us. He never becomes common or commonplace. His voice is as the sound of many waters. As in Nature and as in great poetry, there is in Him a richness we never come to the end of. He never disappoints us; in Him is the fullness of God Himself; He is to us a fountain that fails not, and the water He gives is in us as a well of water springing up into everlasting life.

II.

One Sabbath day when Jesus had healed an impotent man, telling him to take up his bed and walk, the Jews cried out upon Him for breaking the Sabbath. Jesus, however, was quite unmoved by such criticism. In healing the sick man He had done what in His heart He knew to be right and good—what God had shown and given Him. Nor was that all. What He had done, He declared boldly to His critics, He would do again; He would even do more. If that day He had done a great thing at which men marvelled, He would

yet do greater things at which they would marvel still more. 'For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doeth; and he will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel' (Jn 5^{20}). To heal the sick was a great thing; but that, after all, was a small thing compared with that which was yet to come—the healing of souls, the changing and renewing of hearts. Christ came to minister, and He healed all who were brought to Him; yet at the best they were but few. But He came also not merely to minister to a few, but to give His life a ransom for many. He came not only to serve a few, but to save the world. There were things that He had done; but there remained greater things still—the things He was to suffer.

For the story of Jesus is a story that works towards a climax. He gave His time, His strength, His compassion; but in the end He gave Himself. He was among men as one that served; but at the last He crowned His service with sacrifice. And then, indeed, we marvel and are amazed. It is when the Son of Man is lifted up upon the Cross that He draws us to Him and wins our hearts. That God should love like that—that is what touches our hearts, melts the ice about them, so that they are truly broken and grace enters in to save.

And as it was with the Master, so should it be with the disciples. His life-story is one that moves from things great to things greater. What is ours? On our life-chart how does the curve run? Since we first knew the Lord, have we gone back or have we gone forward? Is it possible that our love has grown colder, that religion means less to us than once it did, that we are doing less to-day than we used to do for Christ's Church and Kingdom? It is not for us who call ourselves by the name of Christ to do so un-Christlike a thing as to try to get through life with as little trouble as possible, to try to get off with as little as we dare to offer. If we are doing a little, we may not be proud and boast of it; rather should we walk humbly and ask always whether we could not do a little more. To think we do enough, or imagine we are good enough, is fatal. For it means we are facing in the wrong direction. The only right way, as Paul suggests, is to forget the things that are behind, however great they be, and reach forward to the things, the greater things, that are before. The more we do and the more we mingle with others, the richer and fuller is our life; and it is in the stress and struggle of work that we are shaped to goodness. And character is what we are here for.

III.

On the eve of His death Jesus said a strange thing. He told His disciples that after He was gone they would do not merely such things as He had done, but things even greater. 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father' (Jn 14^{12}). His disciples, He said, would do greater things than He, their Master and Lord, had done! It sounds absurd, incredible, impossible. And yet, in a very real sense, it is true. Jesus' own work was confined to the little land of Palestine and to the little nation of the Jews; the Apostles carried the gospel to the Gentiles, and their successors to the ends of the earth. Jesus made but a beginning and won only a few; Peter at Pentecost gathered in a whole multitude, and Paul planted churches not only in Asia, but in Europe; and to-day there is hardly a province or a tribe where the name of Christ is not known. All, indeed, that has been done is of Christ's doing; for, if His disciples won triumphs larger and wider, it was only because He, dying, had given them a gospel to preach, and because He, rising from the dead, kept them assured of His presence and filled them with His Spirit. But Jesus spoke as He did, telling them that, while they had much to look back to, there was even more to which they could look forward, because only so could they be encouraged and inspired for their task. For, had not Jesus pointed them to greater things in the future, they might have kept looking back to the great things of the past, which were indeed great, and rested and settled down in them; they might have spent their time speaking to one another of the happy days in Galilee or recalling the great miracles that were wrought and the great words that were spoken; and so, lost in a sentimental reverie, never have risen up and gone out to carry the good news to others.

And there, too, lies the danger for ourselves. We are all more or less prone to idealize and praise the past, to speak as if all the great events of history lay behind us, or as if there were none nowadays so godly and devoted as the men of the Reformation or the Disruption. But such an attitude is faithless and unbelieving, and such a tendency is to be firmly checked. For God is not dead; He is the living God, who faints not nor grows weary in well-doing, who has many things yet to give us, and who, if He has done great things in the past, is ready in the future to do even greater things. The days of miracles, it may be, are past. But that

is a small matter. For Jesus by His miracles healed only a few, whereas the medical missionaries of to-day heal thousands every year. In the religious life of the past there was more perhaps of the picturesque—more revivals, more sudden conversions; but to-day, by work more sober and less showy, by unceasing instruction, by loyal fellowship, many men and women are being built up in Christian faith and character. And, besides, within the last fifty years, far more have been gathered into the Church of Christ than in the first five centuries of the Christian era. Are not these the greater things which Jesus said His disciples would accomplish? When a thing is difficult, we are apt to back away from it and say it cannot be done. But there is nothing history tells us so plainly as that things once declared impossible have nevertheless in the end been done; and a recent writer is bold enough to say that science is the most Christian thing we have in the world to-day—because it refuses to be defeated, goes on trying and experimenting, and insists on looking for those greater things that are yet to come. Not long ago it was held by most that men would never be able to fly; yet to-day aeroplanes are in daily use. Therefore, when a big task confronts us, when a great social evil has to be uprooted, when the gospel has to be preached to the millions of India and China, let us not say the thing is impossible. To say it is impossible is to make it impossible. 'Fear not, only believe,' Jesus says to us; and again, 'Have faith in God.' If the thing is right and according to the will of God, then it can be done and will be done. For He who is with us is greater than all who may be against us; and His purpose and His promise are that we shall always go forward—from great things to things greater still.

How is it that we Christians are not better than we are? We find ourselves such poor creatures, so full of faults and meannesses, that we are sometimes astonished at, or even disgusted with, ourselves, and are fain to wonder whether it is not Christianity itself that must be at fault, since, after all, it has done so little for us or with us. Perhaps we are so discouraged about ourselves that we have even given up trying, or expecting, to be better. And just there is the trouble with us—we have ceased to hope, to look for those greater things which Christ promised to those who follow Him. Our moral task is not an easy one. Yet, after all, it is not a task alien or impossible. That we should be good is what God made us for; it is what He desires for us; it is what He is most eager to help us to. No good thing will God withhold. When He has given one gift, He is already preparing a greater. Only let us ask in faith; only let us go on hoping and expecting. 'Thou shalt see greater things than these'; 'Greater works than these shall he do.' God who gave His Son to death for us, will yet with Him freely give us all things.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Barth's Critics and Disciples.[1]

Schmidt's important book, which deserves careful study by all who would follow the impulse given by Barth to German theology, consists of three sections. The first is a searching and destructive criticism of the principles of the dialectic theology from the point of view of one who is at once gratefully conscious of the religious appeal in Barth's work, and yet sure that the dialectic method, so far from being truly Biblical, fails in a due appreciation of Scripture. A gulf lies between a theology based on dialectic, and one with its roots in a real appreciation of historical experience from the beginning down to the present moment. Barth sets revelation outside the limits of history and religion, beyond the bounds of experience, and by a ruthless dialectic antithesis of God and man, time and eternity, accompanied by an entirely negative valuation of all the results of human striving, he would clear the way for the entrance of the Divine miracle in which the eternal cuts across the temporal and makes a new beginning, a new creature. All sorts of values are thus thrown overboard. The positive religious experience of the Old Testament saints, and of Jesus Himself and the believers' enjoyment of present salvation are ignored: the

[1] H. W. Schmidt, *Zeit und Ewigkeit* (Bertelsmann; M.15).

J. W. Schmidt-Japing, *Die Christologischen Anschauungen der dialektischen Theologie* (Bertelsmann; M.0.80).

Th. L. Haitjema, *Karl Barth's 'Kritische' Theologie* (Veenman & Zonen; M.2.90).

Cross' is merely the final revelation of chaos. Christology is impossible. Jesus, like the Bible, contains, rather than is, the Word. Unbelief is no longer guilty, for it is merely a prudent refusal to make a venture. Only at the Resurrection, beyond history, is there pure revelation ; all history is really obliterated in the light of eternity. In all this no explanation is given why the ' crisis ' should suddenly yield positive results, why judgment should disclose grace. Neither Brunner, with his leaning to mysticism, nor Althaus, with his attempt at including history, really overcomes the weakness of Barth's position.

Schmidt then proceeds to develop what he regards as the key to a proper theology based four-square on history rather than dialectic, namely, a true exposition of the actual relation between eternity and time. Eternity is not the contradiction of time, but is ' time-filled.' The absolute opposition of time and eternity is purely dialectical. Time really yields forms in which eternity realizes itself. Time, for example, is an expression of the love and patience of God. Eternity is pervaded by time rather than in contrast to it. History is therefore a revelation of reality, and this is the meaning of the ' eternal now.' It is in the attempt dialectically to define eternity as timeless that the gap is made between God and man, contingent history and absolute truth. Bergson and Einstein are touched upon in this technical and original discussion, which, to the author, is of crucial importance in preparing the way for a due appreciation of history in its relation to eternity, which is necessary to a theology that is matter of fact rather than dialectic.

In developing finally this theology one of the most interesting points is that the true line of advance is taken to be from the place where Herrmann stuck. Hermann, rejecting mysticism and, for no special reason, individual experience, refused to allow its value to the present experience of salvation. But God poured and still pours Himself into history progressively. Kenosis, as a restriction of full revelation, is a necessary concession to free will. Christ Risen is perfected, and did and does reveal Himself to disciples. When the impression of the Person of Jesus produces a compelling experience, the fact of Jesus becomes a present experience of salvation and is the influence of the Holy Spirit. The gap that is felt in Herrmann's teaching regarding the ground of certainty is due to the arbitrary division of history into past and present, whereas what occurs is the total impact. Revelation is the effect of this whole upon the native capacity of human nature to respond, and thus revelation produces faith.

A very similar attitude toward Barth is found in Schmidt-Japing's short pamphlet, which has that merit, rare in German, of a vivacious and attractive style. Remarking at the outset that if God is not recognized in what is present, religion is dead, but also, if God is not recognized in history the living God is lost to view, he connects Barth's emphasis on crisis and on all that is negative with the wave of general post-war hopelessness in Germany. The New Testament seems to be regarded as the quintessence of the Old Testament in respect of its note of failure—a quaintly simple view of what fulfilment means. He notes the relation of mysticism, magic, and dialectic in their common disparagement of fact. He scoffs at the mention in the same breath of sin and the utter doubtfulness of things as if these were interchangeable terms. With a similar acknowledgment of religious debt to Barth, and a profound tribute to Herrmann, he urges that a vivid sense of the value of the Bible record demands that theology should move forward on another line than that of dialectic.

But ' Hands off Barth ' is the burden of Haitjema's short study, which has the advantage of Roman type. As Barth would simply let Paul speak for himself, so he would recall us to the real Barth, whom he hails as a new Schleiermacher, almost a Melchizedek ! The difficulty of reconciling Barth's vertical section of history by revelation with the horizontal occurrence of revelation in history in the word made flesh for thirty years and in the experience of the believer does not exist for him. He accepts Barth's distinction of the effective and the whole gospel, and is shocked at the irreverent critic who twists Barth's concession back on Barth, saying to him in his own words, ' You are right if you too are wrong.' Indeed, he is not concerned to expound Barth in the light of criticism, but rather to expose each critic according to his own folly.

Perhaps the valuable pages are those which give an account of the relation between Barth and Herrmann. It marked a new spiritual epoch to Barth when he first read Herrmann's *Ethik*. His first essay was one published when he was twenty-three in the ' Christliche Welt ' and significantly dealt with the difficulty felt by students fresh from Harnack's historical criticism and Herrmann's intensely personal view of faith, in facing the practical work of the ministry. There are signs now, in spite of Haitjema, that Barth's revolt

from Herrmann will yet transform itself into a development.

This is a book[1] which offers large material to the philosophic student of Schleiermacher, yet it disappoints the reader rather by its lack of sustained interest in the biographical facts of his life and of the course of his friendships. The enduring influence of the sunny piety he met among the 'Brethren' is noted. We have the penetrating remark that Schleiermacher never quite appreciated the moral depth of Kant. An intriguing quotation is given of his description of Eleanore Grünow. 'So much sharpness and force and freedom from all sentimentality, at the same time so soft in pure yielding gentleness and love.' Such concrete matter, however, is buried in the fully documented account of the philosophic interactions of the Aufklärung with large quotations from the relevant correspondence. If one were to suggest that the book might have been shorter, the reply would doubtless be that it might easily have been made far, far longer.

For Schleiermacher and his friends were copious writers. In regard to 'Love,' for example, here are sixteen pages of quotation and comment without one sentence to cause a smile or quicken the pulse and without the faintest suspicion of uneasiness lest too much is being said.

One may more or less accept as an astounding feature of his great work on Dogmatic that all its quarter of a million words were in some way simultaneously envisaged in his mind so that every expression hangs together and every part may be relevantly related to every other. But must we extend this respectful regard to all his correspondence?

In so beautifully printed a book it seems ungracious to point out one awkward slip, 'er' for 'sie' near the foot of p. 80.

In these lectures,[2] delivered to a short school for ministers and teachers, the question is discussed, what Paul means by 'the Word.' Certainly not a magic spell, nor a mystic symbol of reality, but 'the Word' in a meaning akin to that of the 'Word of Jehovah' in Old Testament prophecy. Schmitz points out three features emphasized in Paul's use of this expression: the gospel has a defined content; it is not simply lectured upon, but preached; it is not functioning, not really present, unless the Spirit of God makes it effective in the hearer. These conditions being present, the Word is what it conveys, and either idolizing or despising of the letter is avoided in recognizing that the same Divine reality present in Jesus is present in the Word preached and received.

But lest this suggests a bright if obvious address to Christian workers, let us quote a typical sentence from the rather dreary discussion: 'The Word does not cease to belong to objective experience through the fact that it includes the non-objective that has become objective.' R. W. Stewart.

Glasgow.

---

[1] Georg Wehrung, *Schleiermacher in der Zeit seines Werdens* (Bertelsmann. Pp. 336. M.12).

[2] Otto Schmitz, *Die Bedeutung des Wortes bei Paulus* (Bertelsmann. Pp. 46. M.1.50).

The Unwritten Counterpart of the Gospels.

By the Reverend Edward Beal, Glasgow.

The writing of biography was far away from the intention of the men who gave us our first three Gospels. Their aim was rather polemic — the directing of a counterstroke against certain heresies which had invaded the thought of the Early Church —and the method which the Evangelists used was that of citing some of the odd words and historical traditions about Jesus Himself. The first three Gospels, placed together, form only a very small book indeed; and how could it have been possible to have crowded into such a narrow compass anything like a complete account, even in the baldest terms, of a life so eventful and significant? There must have been a great expanse of time and a wealth of extraordinary as well as everyday incident about which we are left entirely in the dark. 'Critics,' says Schmiedel, 'continually forget that Jesus must have said a hundred- or a thousand-fold more than He is reported to have said, that the Gospels contain but a very imperfect extract from

His discourses, and that all those utterances of His have been lost which not merely His first hearers, but even the following generation down to the compilation of the Gospels or their sources did not consider of absolute importance.' Not only so, however, for a view like Schmiedel's, allowing as it does for the vagaries of literary selection, makes no mention whatever of the immense amount of other material—written memoirs, accounts of discourses, early letters, and so forth—which have now been lost almost beyond the hope of rediscovery. There was unquestionably a vast counterpart of the first three Gospels, a written and an unwritten counterpart, the former of which is lost, at least, for the time being, the latter of which, alas! has been irretrievably forgotten.

Could there be any value in an attempt to form some estimate as to the nature of these missing memoirs, or as to the enlightenment on the character of Jesus which they might have afforded us? Such an inquiry is hopeless. The precise form of these memorabilia we can never know; the only hope we may still cherish is that which rests upon the precarious accident of future discovery. Yet to the man who believes that nothing happens without the concurring Providence of God, this loss, while it will provide a most fascinating scope for imaginative day-dreams, will give rise to no real gravity of concern. There is no reason, of course, why the disciple should not desire to know the nature of these details and documents; yet there is no reason, on the other hand, for his deploring their loss. True enough, the slightest item of reliable evidence as to the life of our Lord is of an importance incalculable, and he would be a daring man who declared the existing Gospels of themselves adequate to all our spiritual needs. Scores of problems there are to-day upon which the frankly-stated opinions of Jesus would come to believers with the rare redolence of finality: the motive in the mind of Judas, the form of those resurrection appearances which the Gospels mention but do not describe, perhaps just a few more words about the childhood and youth of Jesus, whatever words He may have spoken upon the problems of war, slavery, industry, men and women. But we have no faithful premises upon which to work, and the risk of error would be too great to warrant the task. We are therefore brought to the crucial point of this discussion: that it is the *fact* that this counterpart exists, not the mere effort to guess at its precise nature, which should be of help to the thinker in his approach to the Gospel narratives.

I.

In the first place, if men would grow into the habit of mind of doing all their thinking in the light of the real circumstances of Gospel compilation—notwithstanding the form of inspirational theory they might individually hold—there might exist between Christians a far deeper spirit of toleration. In all the discussions which have arisen recently between the different popular schools of Christian teachers, there has been a deplorable absence of that sane 'consenting not to know' which is surely the first evidence of the real spirit of the disciple circle of Jesus. Upon any given subject the champions of one view will uphold the New Testament as being on their side, while those approving the contrary theory will freely supply instances and key-words supporting themselves. We have thus an army of carefully marshalled facts for, and of equally convincing facts against, any stated standpoint—but what of the unrecorded facts, if facts alone are to be the ground of argument? An interesting sidelight upon this sort of erroneous method is given in an essay by "Alpha of the Plough," who tells a story of a London journalist who was down on his luck and who happened to be sent to report a banquet. 'He went,' we are told, 'was seen by a waiter to put a silver-handled knife into his pocket, was stopped as he went out, examined, and the knife discovered—also, in his waistcoat pocket, a number of pawntickets for silver goods. Could any one, on such facts, doubt he was a thief? Yet he was perfectly innocent, and in the subsequent hearing his innocence was proved. Being hard up, he had parted with his dress clothes, and had hired a suit at a pawn-broker's. The waist of the trousers was too small, and after an excellent dinner he felt uncomfortable. He took up a knife and cut some stitches behind. As he was doing so, he saw a steely-eyed waiter looking in his direction; being a timid person he furtively put the knife in his pocket. The speeches came on, and when he had got his "take" he left to transcribe it, having forgotten all about the knife. The pawnbroker's tickets, which seemed so strong a collateral evidence of guilt, were, of course, not his at all. They belonged to the owner of the suit.'

It is thus to be clearly seen that a most convincing array of facts in favour of some specific theory really counts for nothing at all where the real criterion of judgment ought to be something higher and broader. One man may argue for eternal damnation, buttressing his theory upon the Parable of Dives and Lazarus; yet the plain truth is that

there are other parables which bear with equal force upon the subject from the opposite standpoint, not to speak of a vast amount of teaching which we have never seen—the unknown factors in the case—all of which might fall to the one side or the other. The point of all this is, of course, that it is not the so-termed facts of the gospel narratives which count in the long-run at all: it is something of infinitely vaster significance which lies behind them.

II.

But before passing on to speak of this more authoritative force it might be well to touch upon one or two further fallacies as they stand revealed by our knowledge that this counterpart exists. One of these is the fallacy which argues from the alleged silence of Jesus upon certain subjects. It is no new thing for men to challenge the entire teaching of our Lord as out of date—bearing upon questions remote from our present horizon, while neglecting altogether other problems which vitally concern the modern Christian. Jesus says nothing about slavery, sweating, and patriotism, and little about war, we are told. He says little about God and the reality of the future life; and one ingenious method of accounting for these latter silences is to point out that He assumed God and heaven as indubitable. But a likelier explanation is surely the much more simple one, that upon many of these vexing questions Jesus had a very great deal to say. The solution to the silence of the Gospels lies in the smallness of the Gospels themselves. One might as well accuse Browning of belief in a malevolent Supreme Power because he does not mention the goodness of God in *Porphyria's Lover*. It is no longer possible to argue for a moment this way or that way from the silence of Jesus. We know, in part, what He said; we cannot know what He did not say.

III.

There is surely a patent need for the utmost care in our appeal to the letter of the Gospels or even to the Sermon on the Mount. The Gospels themselves do not necessarily contain that portion of His teaching which He considered to be the most important; they include the words and sayings which appealed to those who recalled them for certain purposes. The quoting of proof-texts, from whatever portion of the Gospels they might have been selected, is becoming less and less permissible as we more thoroughly appreciate the conditions which led to the making of the documents.

The real question for people to answer when confronted with a moral issue upon which the authority of Jesus is required is whether or not the issue squares with what we know to be the spiritual consciousness of Jesus as revealed by the whole broad trend of the Gospels. If, for example, the question should be that of war, the point is not whether our Lord in so many words condoned it or condemned it—by bidding us love our enemies, or by declaring that He came to bring a sword rather than peace—but whether war could ever be made to find a place in His ethic of sacrifice and spirituality. To that question one answer alone is possible.

IV.

And we do need to be thankful that we can get back so readily to the inner consciousness of Jesus by a study of the books as we have them before us. For, having accomplished this, the Christian may work henceforward from a spiritual groundwork which is inviolable. Here lies the disciple's true and ultimate authority, and singularly enough men of utter diversity of opinion have grown accustomed to meet at this point: that of the full, free spirit of the eternal Christ. In other words, the conception of the spirit and character of Christ, as interpreted by those who have honestly and fearlessly studied the Gospels, and have at equal pains sought fellowship with Him, is largely the same in all cases.

It is here that the element of finality in our authority lies. Those who have learned to rely wholly upon the indwelling Christ can afford to wait for future discoveries, for their appeal to the spirit of Jesus depends upon no further record. Christ Himself is the final and unassailable appeal, standing high above the possible omissions of His reporters and the fallibility of any human standpoint. The central principle of His consciousness was that of the Cross, and this is still the sole solution of every perplexity arising out of our tangled civilization. And, judging by the nature of our records about Christ's life, God evidently intended the spirit of the Cross to guide us in our very investigations and discussions as to Jesus Himself.

Entre Nous.

The Worship of To-morrow.

It is a good thing that by the terms of their foundation the Merrick Lectures in Ohio Wesleyan University have to be published. For in this way Professor G. A. Johnston Ross was left no choice about the publication of the five lectures which he delivered last year on *Christian Worship and its Future* (Abingdon Press; $1.00). Dr. Johnston Ross is not only well known by his writing, but by his fruitful ministries in Scotland and Cambridge, and his fitness to lecture on this subject will be unchallenged. He limits his subject to organized, collective Christian worship, and while all the lectures contain much that is thought-provoking, we turn to the last—the worship of the future—with some eagerness. Some of his suggestions we may not like, and we may even reject them, but if it be so, let it be after due thought and not because they conflict with preconceived ideas.

Dr. Johnston Ross has six suggestions.

1. He hopes that the worship of the future will have at its heart a more adequate conception of God. 'I welcome, as I hope you do, every sign that men are beginning to feel that God our Father loveth *all* that he hath made and is interested in *all* our work and in *all* our play. I feel sure that coming generations will delight to place in their churches, and thus to use as aids to devotion, symbols of the interest of God in science (for example, in agriculture), in arts, in multiform beneficence, and in clean sport. The placing of a sports window in the Cathedral of Saint John the Divine in New York illustrates what I mean. For far too many centuries the one extra-ecclesiastical interest, if it be right to call it that, which our great cathedrals associated with God was the art of war.'

2. 'I cannot but hope and believe that the worship of the future in Protestant churches will be recognized as an outgoing not of our intellect only but of our whole nature—intellectual, emotional, and volitional.' To-day our volitional nature is not given the scope it ought to have in worship. We don't take the word 'sacrifice' seriously enough. Dr. Johnston Ross sees the danger that the perfunctory monetary offering of to-day may be neutralizing our sacrificial impulse, and believes that in the Church of the future there will be offerings of other forms of human service 'especially of personal service in dealing with individuals and with social situations.'

3. 'With all my heart I trust the worship of the future will return to the *gladness* of early Christian worship, and to the use of everything that wisely ministers to Christian joy.' What are some of those things which minister to joy? Sweet odours are one. And so we have the suggestion that incense should be used in worship, and an objection to it met by the remark, 'Have you always found sweet odors distracting from the thought of Him who "perfumes every rose in our gardens?"' Do not let us be afraid of symbolism, he says, and he reinforces his position with points from Dr. Franz Delitzsch's essay, 'Black and White.' In this essay Dr. Delitzsch 'discusses the question of the color of the official dress of the ministers of the church. That official dress, he says, was white from the first; as were all liturgical vestments. In the Koran the apostles are called the White Ones. The German reformers, unlike the Swiss, recognized the seemliness of distinguishing between the secular dress and the official vestments of their ministers. But they introduced black, which had never been a liturgical dress. Black, says Delitzsch, stands for everything that Christianity is not; for death, the keeping up of esoteric mystery; for death and condemnation, for trouble and mourning; in every respect in contradiction to the essential character of the New Testament religion and of the gospel ministry. For white worn over black, Delitzsch finds symbolic meaning, namely, that though the minister has died to the world and its pleasures, as servant in the spiritual world, he lives and walks in the light of God. For black alone he finds "no meaning corresponding to the nature of Christianity."'

4. 'The worship of the future will from time to time 'break through language and escape' from the tyranny of articulate speech. 'There are reaches of adoration, of thanksgiving, of love, of shame, of expectation, where words are impotent and even irrelevant, for we confront at those moments and in those areas the Ineffable in God that saves. I confidently pray that the worship of the future will re-establish in a central place a sacramental silence.'

5. The fifth point is a plea for the internationalization of Protestant Churches. On the practical point, How can the difficulty of language be conquered?, Dr. Johnston Ross says frankly that he does not know, but he believes that there might be a common ritual act in which worship everywhere should find its climax. 'Though I be laughed

at now for the suggestion, I plead for the beginnings of attempts to set up a supernational, superlingual and superdenominational form of service for the expression and stimulation of that movement of the collective human soul in self-oblation which is the central response to the great objective fact of Divine Grace.'

'May I make a single personal reference? It happens that serving in my household are two good girls—one a Polish stranger to this land, and one an Irish girl from Jersey City. Both came recently as complete strangers to the little town in which I live. I confess to envying these girls as I saw them go off together to Mass. I began to regard with more respect than I formerly did the rigorous order of the Roman Church restricting the saying of Mass to the Latin tongue. For here were these two girls finding a common medium of fellowship in the language both could "understand." I tested the matter thus. On their return I asked the Polish girl to submit to a little examination.

"Yanina, what is 'Dominus vobiscum'?"

"'De Lord be veet you,' Doctor."

"What is 'Et cum spiritu tuo'?"

"'And veet dy speereet.'"

"What is 'Agnus Dei qui tollis peccata mundi'?"

"Oh, Doctor, I no can say it in English. Vait a meenit. It is dis: 'O Lamb von Gott what takes away de seen of de vorld.'"

"Yanina, do you know any Latin?"

"What? Me? Oh, no, Doctor."'

6. 'The intellect of the church will, I believe, after a little time has passed, return upon and rest in the divine philosophy of the cross: and as it does so, the devotion of the church will also find its organizing center there.'

Jerusalem.

Bishop Blyth left Jerusalem for the last time in 1914: he died very soon after he reached England. He himself destroyed all his personal papers, and asked that no biography of him be written. Whilst respecting his wishes not only in the letter but in the spirit, one of his daughters, Miss Estelle Blyth, felt that there was still room for her to write her memories of Jerusalem as it was during the years when they knew it so well, and before conditions changed so radically with the advent of the world war. She calls her book *When We Lived in Jerusalem* (Murray; 12s. net). To those who have lived in Jerusalem its appeal should be irresistible; but it has a wider appeal than that. It is, to the public which likes a well-told story, full of vivid pictures of incident and custom and clear analysis of political bodies and religious sects. And we see Palestine better because Miss Blyth contrasts it with other lands. France, for example, was a civilized power at home rather than a Christian one, but 'France abroad is the protectress of Western Christianity. Lay but a finger upon monk or nun or pilgrim, and the whole machinery of French power is quickened into wrathful action. A French Consul said to us once, "It is as much as my post is worth to be seen in church in France, and as much as it is worth *not* to be seen in church in Palestine!"'

As an example of Miss Blyth's power of vivid presentation we might perhaps quote a few sentences from her description of the Russian pilgrims in Palestine. After telling us that a Russian Consul once declared that he estimated each Russian pilgrim as being worth on an average £10 to Palestine, she goes on to say that that was the least part of their gift. 'They brought into her a religious devotion as deep as it was genuine, and a fervour of unquestioning belief unequalled elsewhere in a weary and disillusioned world. . . . Sheep-like, they trudged along together, kissed the same holy pictures in turn, fell prostrate at the same holy site, asking nothing better than to give their mite for its enrichment, fleeced alike by monk and priest and beggar. . . . As they went about in little bands you seldom heard them talking to each other, but from the moving lips, the cross signed suddenly on breast or brow, you knew they spoke to God. . . . It was impossible to watch a Russian pilgrim congregation in church without catching some faint reflection of their fire.'

Salted and Swaddled.

'Every Palestinian baby is well washed and salted at birth, as a measure against possible infection. There are various ways of doing this: the little body may be dipped into a bath of brine, or it may be rubbed all over with salt and olive oil; or, again, salt may be rubbed into the swaddling-bands, which are then wrapped round and round it till the unfortunate mite looks more like a mummy or a cocoon than a human baby. The tightness of the swaddling-clothes is believed to keep the back and limbs straight, and the baby is left in them for seven days always, and sometimes for as many as forty, in the case of Moslem peasant children. "Those that I have swaddled and brought up, hath mine enemy consumed!" was the lament of Jeremiah; and Ezekiel could find no more convincing simile for the utter wretchedness of Jeru-

salem in his day than that of a neglected infant: "Thou wast not salted at all, nor swaddled at all." "All men have one entrance into life," said Solomon, who himself was "nursed in swaddling-clothes, and that with cares." Doubtless the custom was ancient in Old Testament days, and doubtless it will be in force when our Age, too, has drifted into the shadows of history.'[1]

A Salutary Lesson.

'The Rev. Haskett Smith was a traveller of whom we heard much, for he came two or three times to Jerusalem. . . . He told us an amusing story against himself. Soon after his ordination he went down to the village in which he had been brought up to conduct a mission there; the services were well attended, and he thought that his addresses had made a real impression. At the close of the mission, he came back into the church for some reason, and saw a solitary man sitting at the end, who was wielding a large bandana and appeared to be overcome by his feelings. Mr. Smith went to him, and asked if he could do anything for him; at which the other, looking up, revealed himself as the local butcher who had known him from infancy, and wiping his streaming face remarked, "'Ot, ain't it? 'Ow's your pa?" As Mr. Smith said, no young preacher could have had a more salutary lesson!'[2]

The Influence of Christianity on Literature.

'The influence of Christianity on modern literature is as vital and all-permeating as that of the air on the creatures that breathe it. Even where the makers of that literature are unconscious of it, or unwilling to recognize it, they are dependent upon it for the very colour of the corpuscles in their intellectual veins. . . . If we include Dante as the supreme figure of mediæval literature, the singer in whom, at once, the Middle Ages culminated and the modern period began; and if we survey those works of literature from his day to our own, which seem to possess qualities of permanent value, it is impossible to dissociate them from certain elements that have been contributed to human thought and emotion by the Christian religion, even though these elements may be seized and transmuted as the oxygen of the atmosphere is transmuted by those who breathe it. It is not carrying the analogy too far to say that in many cases the distinctly anti-Christian literature in many respects corresponds only to what is breathed out again after the breather has extracted, consciously or unconsciously, what he needed for his own life; . . . For the influence of Christianity is not limited to those who acknowledge it, or are aware of it.'[3]

Vision.

A volume of essays on such varied subjects as the Book of Job, Faithlessness, the Abstractness of Creeds, The True Time of Things, and Beauty as Meaning, has been published by E. V. Lindsay—the wife of the Master of Balliol—through the Student Christian Movement. The title is *The Spirit to Think* (3s. 6d. net). The treatment in each case is short and, indeed, it can hardly be called an essay. It is rather an unfolding of Mrs. Lindsay's inner convictions, an adventure in the understanding of the great things of the spirit. At the end of the volume are 'Verses,' touched with real imagination. We quote 'Vision':

'Give us this day our daily bread.'
How often have the words been said
By men, when there before them lay
Bread from Heaven day by day;
When, had but faith been in their prayer,
Sight had come to see it there.

Then may my soul its strength renew
With what is lying in its view;—
This very sky, this cloud, this tree
Raising its magic tracery
Against a springing fount of light;
This snow of cherry blossom white,
This wet road's gleam—all yet more fair
For clearness of this cold, clear air,
Pure as might shame, calm as might still
The restless dream, the heedless will.

[1] P. 287 f.

[2] P. 212 f.

[3] Alfred Noyes, in *An Outline of Christianity: The Story of our Civilization*, iv. 163.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

There is no doctrine that has been more radically affected by modern thinking than that of the Atonement. And we seem to be at present in an atmosphere which is fatal to some of the beliefs which were characteristic of the nineteenth century. This change of mental attitude to the Cross has been brought about imperceptibly by the influences which have been moulding the creed of the present generation. Among these are the new emphasis on the humanity of Jesus, the concentration on the Gospels at the expense of the Epistles, the insistence on the historical record of our Lord's life as alone normal and authoritative, the freer attitude to Paul's authority, so that it can be said with confidence to-day that if a theory is in accord with the mind of Christ in the Gospels it is part of Christianity; if not, it must be abandoned.

The newer point of view is expounded at some length by Dr. Douglas White in the current number of *The Modern Churchman* in an article on 'The Christian Doctrine of Forgiveness.' At the outset he makes a remark which is profoundly true and wholly significant both with regard to his own views and with regard to those of others. He says that the two foci of Christianity are the Incarnation and the Atonement, and 'the ideas which they convey are closely interrelated. Whatever you think of the one is bound to react on your thought of the other.' He does not pursue that line of thought, but his article is a proof of its truth. Behind all views of the Atonement are views of the Person of Christ. If to you Christ is the Eternal Son of God you will not find it hard to conceive of something being done at the Cross which is an objective ground of forgiveness. If you believe that Jesus is only a revelation of God, has 'the value of God,' then anything of this kind is incredible.

Dr. White does not pursue this. Instead, he addresses himself to the questions: What do we mean by atonement? And what is there in the Atonement that is valid and true for us to-day? He divides all theories of the Atonement into two classes. Is it a satisfaction of God's justice, or a revelation of His love? It cannot be both, he says, for these are mutually contradictory hypotheses. This is one of a number of statements that even a modernist might very fitly question. The very nerve of the Catholic doctrine of the Atonement is that the Cross is the supreme revelation of God's love *because* it is the satisfaction of His justice. His love is so great that what hinders its outflow must at all costs be removed. God is love, but He is righteous love, and love that simply pardons without conditions is not moral. So at least the orthodox believer would argue. And certainly, whether the orthodox believer is right or wrong in his belief, this statement of his is sound. The real power of the orthodox theory of the Atonement, its evangelical force, has always been its disclosure of the heart of God. That is quite apart from the truth or otherwise of the orthodox view.

Dr. White goes on to criticize, and reject, the traditional theory of the Atonement, which, he says, is the doctrine that satisfaction was rendered to God by Christ, on the ground of which we are forgiven. This idea of satisfaction given to God offends Dr. White. But why? In its naïve forms it is certainly unchristian. The idea of 'reconciling' God is an unpleasant idea. The idea of God's honour needing to be placated is as much so. But satisfaction in itself is an ethical idea. If I am asked to inspect a piece of work I must be satisfied before I pass it. I may love my child tenderly, but if I am not satisfied that he is doing honest work I cannot have complete confidence in him. There are primitive, and even savage, forms of this satisfaction idea. But there are better forms, and in its best form it simply means that God's forgiveness, like man's, must be ethical.

Dr. White, of course, follows in the tradition of Abelard, and such modern successors of his as Dr. Hastings Rashdall. With this view every one must have sympathy. It has been maintained by some of the noblest spirits in the history of Christianity, and it has been inspired by loyalty to the mind of our Lord. Its protest has been against the severe, and almost savage and immoral, conceptions of a crude substitutionary theory and an equally crude legalistic view. We have nothing but sympathy for Dr. White's effort to reach a view of the Cross which is intelligible and ethical as well as true to the mind of Christ Himself. But his essay, while sincere and earnest, does not do justice to the best thought on this high subject on the 'Catholic' side, nor does it go deep enough in its analysis of forgiveness. Dr. White sums up the message of the Cross thus: 'Jesus has declared that God is a loving Father; you have only to come back to the love from which you have wandered.' That is a great message. But is that all that the Cross means?

Georg Mehlis, D.Phil., is well known in German theological circles as a rising scholar of great promise. He has written on Mysticism and the Philosophy of History, and his work is marked by penetrating insight and deep sincerity of religious feeling. He is now turning to the Philosophy of Religion, and we have pleasure in cordially welcoming his brief introductory essay on that subject in English dress, under the title *The Quest for God* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net).

We have already many outstanding works on the Philosophy of Religion, but there is still plenty of room for more. Some are so profound that the ordinary reader is discouraged and repelled; some are so superficial that the thinker is merely irritated. If Dr. Mehlis writes his promised large and critical work in the manner of this preliminary sketch he will have performed a meritorious service. For he can evidently sound the depths of the subject, while his treatment wears the appearance of grace and facility.

It may be of interest to our readers to learn how this scholar views the religious situation of our time. Most of us have been somewhat concerned about it. The general decline in regularity of Church attendance, the prevalence of a seeming indifference to spiritual and even to moral issues, the rise of fresh rivals to the Church such as (in some quarters) the Labour Movement—such things have occasioned serious questioning as to whether religion is holding, or is likely to hold, its place. Dr. Mehlis would not have us unduly alarmed. Indeed, he would not have us alarmed at all. On the whole he finds the situation hopeful. The controversies aroused in the Roman Church by Modernism, and by Fundamentalism among Protestants, are, he points out, at any rate signs of life. Even movements which stand as rivals or bear a surface antagonism to Christianity, as it is known in worship, creeds, and Confessions, admit of an interpretation which, he thinks, makes them in reality witnesses to 'a keener interest in Religion.'

Take theosophy and the other occultisms so rife in our day. 'The strange appearance of theosophy and other forms of occult religion is but a clear proof of the awakened interest in religion to-day. Their teaching has become widespread during the last ten years. It would be more than foolish to attempt to

dispose of them with a gesture of superiority, relegating them to the backwoods of crass superstition. The growth of occult religion is one of the most interesting symptoms of our time.' 'I do not think we shall be far wrong when we suggest it portends a search for new outward forms in which to clothe religious worship—above all, it is seeking for new dogmas of religious life in accordance with truths that are now established.'

Or take Marxian Socialism. 'Its determined opposition to religion was purely fictitious. The idea of the founder was a great metaphysical conception, none other than the sacred idea of redemption. We must know and understand the former conditions of the lives of the working masses, in order to grasp how it was possible for this teaching to fan to life a holy flame of enthusiasm and joy in the hearts of the weary and heavy-laden.' 'Religious thought is always directed towards helping the poor, the wronged, the wretched and the suffering; it all seems so desperately wrong to one whose heart is filled with religion.' 'I am not thinking of Marxian Socialism as party politics, but as an important and apparently materialistic movement where a religious thought is the spark that lights the lamp.'

On the other hand, we are still suffering, in the author's view, from some tendencies that are inimical to true religion, most of them a legacy from the latter years of the eighteenth century. 'They all have this in common, that they entirely misconstrue the essential meaning and absolute value of religion. They seem to imagine that religion is something preliminary, revealing a naïve, fantastic view of life, comparable to childhood in the life of man.' 'To be sceptical in matters of religion proclaims the man of the world, it is a sign of a certain intellectual maturity, of reasoning powers, a proof of a clear, rational grasp of things as they are.' Further, 'the current utilitarianism of the age is inimical to religion.' For in this light 'man makes use of religion to weave a fantastic dream of happiness.'

Lastly, 'Another thing that hinders religious life in the present age is the extraordinary value set upon activity—the hurry of the times that cannot tolerate quiet devotion, with a peaceful contemplation of the world, with a thoughtful insight into the secret innermost. And the voice of religion rings clearest where all is quiet and silence reigns.'

Professor C. Anderson Scott's new book, *The Church: Its Worship and Sacraments—A Free Church Interpretation* (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), has the three simple divisions of its title, and each is thought-provoking. Starting from the familiar words of Mt 16^{18}, 'And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell will not prevail against it,' Dr. Scott sees in them a deliberate claim by Christ that He is doing in a deeper way what God had done once before in history. The Ecclesia is to be the spiritual counterpart of the ancient Hebrew 'people of God,' united as that had been by a covenant, but a covenant which is (Jer 31) to replace the one already broken by man and is to be sealed by the very life-blood of the Master Himself.

The Church is a new covenant society, every member of which owes his place in it to the call of Christ as its Head. Now, just because this Fellowship was established as a Fellowship of the Spirit, it needed and admitted no organization imposed from without (even by its Founder); but under the guidance of the Spirit, it developed from within, adapting itself to different needs and different temperaments. Hence 'all the various forms of Church organization and government with which we are acquainted may claim to have the Divine approval, in so far as they enable the Church to fulfil its appointed functions, even as they must submit to the Divine judgment in so far as they fail to do so.' 'There is much to be said in favour of each . . . but there is one thing that cannot be said in favour of any of them, namely, that it is the form of government without which there can be no true Church.' From this position the author develops the idea of One Holy Catholic Church which is Indestructible and Indispensable. One could wish that he had been less sweeping in his depreciation of

the idea of the Holy in the Old Testament. It may be doubtful whether the moral Holy ever appears there quite free from any material embodiment, yet such a passage as Ps 15 suggests a need for greater caution in language than Dr. Scott has shown.

On worship itself Dr. Scott is good. He finds its basal principle to be sacrifice—our whole personality made over—in affection—as an offering to God. A word of regret may be permitted that his language on p. 51 does less than justice to the great prophets of Israel. To say that under their teaching it was discovered that sacrifices were only symbols is an understatement. There can be little doubt that the prophets rejected material sacrifices as a non-essential and misleading part of religion.

Viewed from a Christian standpoint, then, 'Public Worship, rightly ordered, will do three things: It will provide a sacrifice, which is nothing less than the Body of Christ. It will secure the cleansing and the sanctifying of the sacrifice. And it will culminate in the offering of the sacrifice.' The worshippers are made sensible of their unity in the properly ordered opening of the service; God, by Word and Love and Spirit, cleanses 'the Body of Christ' during the progress of Worship; there but remains the final act, the offering of the sacrifice. The natural thing is to synchronize it with the 'Collection.' 'Is there any reason why the Minister and people should not, after the Collection, bring the whole service to its natural climax and fitting conclusion by repeating together the great sentence of the English Communion Service: "Here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and our bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto Thee." ?'

Many will find much fresh exegesis in the author's treatment of the Lord's Supper. The direction of his teaching may be roughly summarized in his own words: 'The "Body of Christ" was there' (he is speaking of the Early Church view), 'not because through the speaking of certain words by the proper person the Bread and the Wine had been changed into the Body and Blood, but because by the power of the Holy Spirit living men and women had been knit together into a living Body of Christ; because by the same Spirit they had been "consecrated" in public worship; and because they, conscious of themselves as the Body of Christ, had then made corporate offering and sacrifice of themselves to God.' It is a view which will be unfamiliar to many, but which is, as he says, gaining ground; and it is here expounded with great learning and persuasiveness.

The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

By Principal the Reverend Alfred E. Garvie, D.D., London.

Except in a few devout circles, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has in the history of the Christian Church been very generally neglected. And this neglect has even found theological advocates. Dr. Denney in his book, *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, and Dr. Rees in his book on *The Holy Spirit* indicate that they would be content to have it merged in the doctrine of the Living Christ; and Dr. Jackson has recently been contending for that course of treatment. Briefly to state the argument: as the communion with the living Christ and the operation of the Holy Spirit cannot be separated in religious experience, so the doctrine of the one and the other should not be distinguished. There has, however, quite recently been a revival of interest. It is significant that a few years ago, mainly owing to the influence of Dr. Wheeler Robinson, who is understood to be writing a book on the subject, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and the Godhead has been added in the syllabus for the B.D. degree of London University. Significant, too, is the choice of this theme as the guiding idea of the Church Congress recently held in Southport. In the book in which I have tried

to develop my theological system—*The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead*—I have accepted the trinitarian basis, as my study and meditation on the articles of the Christian faith has increasingly convinced me of the loss the neglect of the doctrine involves for Christian life and thought, and the gain of the consideration of it. I welcome the decision of the editors of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES to deal with the subject in a series of articles, and am glad that I have been asked to introduce the series; for as the experience of the Holy Spirit is valuable for Christian religion, so the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is significant for Christian theology.

1. The neglect of the doctrine in the Christian Church is not a proof that it is meaningless and worthless for Christian life and thought, but can be explained by the history. Even in the Apostolic Church, as Paul's writings on the subject show, there was a tendency to lay emphasis on those aspects of the Spirit's presence in the Christian community to which less universal and permanent interest and importance must be assigned, namely, the 'holy enthusiasm' of Pentecost, and the *charismata*, spiritual gifts, which accompanied this consciousness of being 'filled with the Holy Spirit.' Paul, with the moral and religious insight of his saintly genius, laid the greater stress on the inward work of the Spirit in sanctification with its fruit in Christian character. The organization of the Church, a necessary expression of its inspiration, under the stress of heresy and schism on the one hand, and of persecution on the other, tended to supersede that inspiration. Reliance on Church authority displaced dependence on the Spirit's illumination. The neglect of the doctrine was due to the waning of the experience. The crude attempt of Montanism to revive the ecstatic mood further discredited the doctrine. On the other hand, the influence of Greek philosophy made the doctrine of the Logos as a solution of the Christological problem central. The objective and cosmic interest superseded the subjective and psychic. The Macedonian heresy was not due to an independent interest, but a movement in the Christological controversy. Only, when so challenged by heresy, did the Church formulate the dogma of the Holy Spirit, employing the same categories as in the dogma of the Son; it was not because the doctrine of the Holy Spirit had the same crucial importance that the doctrine of the Trinity assumed the form that it did. It was the product not of spiritual harmony, but rather of speculative symmetry. One cannot affirm that later theological formulations were due to any fresh discernments. The later religious movements, in which the doctrine of the Spirit recovered prominence, did not contribute anything of special value to the interpretation of the reality.

2. The grounds on which an independent development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has been depreciated by recent theological writers seem to be at least two. (i) In the first place, the doctrine of the Living Christ and fellowship with Him for the more inward religious life holds the place which the doctrine of the Logos held in the early Christian centuries; and it seems to afford a more adequate alternative to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. It may at once be admitted that the historical reality of Jesus gives to the content of the consciousness of the living Christ, in which that historical reality is, as it were, spiritually diffused and continued, a definiteness which any consciousness of the Spirit's presence and activity lacks. Further, few Christians have the assurance to maintain, as I have heard one Christian minister at least maintain, that they can by reflection in their inner life clearly distinguish and separate the fellowship with the living Christ and the working of His Spirit. Paul did not separate the one from the other, as for him the Spirit of God is also the Spirit of Christ. But he did not for that reason identify Christ and the Spirit, as is sometimes contended by a too rash inference from one passage, where he seems to do so (2 Co $3^{17.\ 18}$). In dealing with the sublime mystery of the Godhead we may in theology interpret religious experience as that does not, and need not, interpret itself; for the whole subject can then be placed in a wider context of reality and thought. The theologian may distinguish Christ and the Spirit, as the believer does not, and need not. In so doing he does not substitute another doctrine, but only renders explicit what is implicit. His finer discrimination may in turn enrich the experience which he is interpreting, for by this discrimination he is putting greater fullness into his conception of God. In distinguishing, however, if he knows his business, he does not separate; for it is the one God with whom as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit he is concerned. To use the language of the creeds, he can distinguish the persons without dividing the substance; the recognition of diversity in God is not a denial of His unity. Further reasons for such discrimination will afterwards be shown.

(ii) Secondly, many Christian theologians even have an aversion to the doctrine of the Trinity because they regard it as a useless and even

bewildering speculation. There is a tendency to make the unreasonable demand that 'the man in the street' shall be the arbiter in all questions. What cannot be plain to him must be set aside as an unnecessary and even illegitimate subtlety. Certainly the gospel should be preached in all simplicity, so that even 'the wayfaring man' may understand. But the popular incapacity for thinking should not be the measure of the theologian's right to think, and express his thoughts. The arithmetical puzzle which the Athanasian Creed appears to be does not justify the too common attitude of aversion to the doctrine. That the philosophical categories in which the dogma has been expressed, three persons in one substance, because of the change of meaning of the first term, and the unintelligibility of the second, mislead and perplex must be admitted. The construction of the doctrine in speculative philosophy, as in the Hegelian, does make it appear very remote from any practical interest. But against these objections it may be urged, that although the terminology and the philosophy which this implies, since words involve thoughts, are not found in the New Testament, yet the New Testament is distinctly and on the whole consistently trinitarian, for God is historically revealed as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; that we are by no means bound to the categories in which the dogma has been formulated, but have not only the right, but even the duty, of giving to the doctrine the most adequate expression for our own thought to-day which our intellectual resources will allow; that even the speculative constructions bear witness that, when profound thinkers have been seeking reality, they have been led to a trinitarian conception of God; and that, as the history of human thought shows, even practical experience, without being aware of it, is in course of time affected by the conclusions which thinkers reach. It may be that theologians who have no speculative interest in the coherence of thought, but only a practical interest in its utility for life, are justified in stopping short at an *economic* trinity, the trinity of revelation, and not pushing on to an *ontological* trinity, the trinity of ultimate reality; but it does seem unreasonable that they should make a virtue out of this their infirmity, and attempt to prohibit those who welcome as also a good gift of God man's capacity to grapple with the last questions the mind can ask, from essaying even though it be the perilous quest of philosophical speculation in interpretation of religious experience.

3. The reasons why, despite these attempts to arrest human thinking, there has been the revived interest in the doctrine already noted are the following: (i) If the early Christian centuries were influenced, even dominated by Greek metaphysics, the modern world has been potently influenced by science; and at different periods by different sciences. In the eighteenth century, physics and mathematics were the main interests, and Newton's was the greatest name; in the nineteenth century biology came to the forefront, and Darwin's was the name to bless or curse. In this century psychology is the fashion of the hour, but has not yet yielded the master mind. This psychological interest directs thought towards the subjectivity of religious experience rather than the objectivity of creeds, codes, rituals, and polities.

(ii) Closely related to this scientific interest is the practical tendency in religion to mysticism. Just as the piety of the Middle Ages was affected by Neo-Platonism, so is the piety of to-day influenced not only by the mystical inheritance of the Christian Church, but also by the wider environment into which it has been brought by our enlarging knowledge of similar tendencies in other religions, especially the religions of India.

(iii) It is the common element in all mysticism, if not always, as in extreme developments, to identify God and man, yet to bring man and God into immediate contact as well as intimate communion. The attribute of God which dominates a good deal of religious thought is that of the Divine immanence. Roman Catholic Modernism attempted an immanental theology: the New Theology in England tried to restate all Christian doctrines on the basis of the Divine immanence. The conception of evolution, which has a much wider range, and rests on a more solid foundation than the Darwinian theory, when theistically interpreted replaces, if not corrected in its one-sidedness, the transcendent by the immanent God. The Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit in my judgment meets the legitimate demand in each of these tendencies, and corrects the errors which some of these developments disclose. We need not retain the doctrine, therefore, merely as an ancient relic which respect of the New Testament and the Early Church forbids us to discard; but we should seek rather to restate its significance and recover its value for the Christian faith of to-day.

4. Even the theologian who does not hold any rigid doctrine of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures must give due regard to the witness of the New Testament to the doctrine based on experience, of what we must, in historical justice, still reverence

as the creative epoch of the Christian Church. Although I am not one of those scholars who regard with suspicion the influence of Hellenic thought on the Christology and Soteriology of the New Testament, as a foreign infusion sullying its pristine purity, yet it gives me some satisfaction to call attention to the fact that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament is more closely attached to the Hebraic inheritance and the earliest experience of the primitive community than is the doctrine of Christ's person and work. It cannot be depreciated as a foreign element. It is not necessary in this introductory article to deal with the New Testament teaching in detail. Only a few considerations of crucial importance must be urged.

(i) The Old Testament does not anticipate the New Testament doctrine of the Trinity, unless in so far as it places the historical figure of the Messiah in the forefront of the hope for the future, and lays stress on the activity of the Spirit of God, which is distinguished from God, but not separated from Him, in human gifts and achievements, and notably in the prophetic consciousness. This distinction of the Spirit of God from God as of the spirit of man from man may be dismissed by the critic of the doctrine as a survival of the primitive animism, but it is more reasonable to conclude that the survival of this element in the highly developed doctrine of God morally and religiously is an evidence that it has an inherent value, making it worthy of survival.

(ii) Even if the teaching of the Fourth Gospel about the Spirit cannot be taken as a *verbatim* report, although I myself believe that these last discourses contain early reminiscences as well as later reflections, the Synoptic evidence is sufficient to prove that Jesus did promise the coming of the Spirit after His own withdrawal. The earliest records of the primitive community record the fulfilment of the promise. Believers in Jesus the Christ as Lord were consciously possessors of the Spirit as zeal and power; 'filled with the Holy Spirit'—that phrase describes the distinctive Christian experience. There was the consciousness of the Risen Lord, the expectation of His visible return in power and glory, and the assurance of the Spirit's presence. Was the distinction which was so real for the Apostolic Age merely an illusion, and may we now set it aside as insignificant and valueless?

(iii) Paul did not depreciate the ecstatic mood and the *charismata* which accompanied it when he subordinated both to the activity of the Spirit in sanctification, just as little as did the prophets abolish the institution of sacrifice when they exalt social righteousness above it. He claimed the possession, and did not abstain from the exercise, of these gifts. The fine gold of this experience did not always remain unalloyed, as in the Corinthian Church. Some of the manifestations were abnormal; and the like have recurred in religious revivals since those early days. That any were entirely supernatural may be doubted, if not on the evidence denied. What was real was the enthusiasm and the energy of the new life, with its religious and moral gains, which this consciousness of the possession of the Spirit of God produced. The sanctification was real, an indubitable evidence of Divine activity.

(iv) However intimately Paul relates Christ and the Spirit, so that whenever Christ is believed as Saviour and Lord, the Spirit is possessed, I am convinced that he nowhere identifies Christ and the Spirit, still less does he confuse them. An utterance of inspired eloquence, impassioned feeling, such as the passage in 2 Co $3^{17.\ 18}$, must not be interpreted with prosaic literalness, or as modifying his consistent trinitarian teaching as in the apostolic benediction in 2 Co 13^{14}, or the discussion about spiritual gifts in 1 Co 12^{4-6}. His monotheistic confession of one God and one Lord in ch. 8^{6} does not require for the immediate purpose any mention of the Spirit.

5. Such in outline is the teaching of the New Testament; it commends itself to my reason and conscience as intelligible and credible. But I do not hold the doctrine of the Holy Spirit solely on the authority of the New Testament; but because it meets needs and corrects errors of to-day in the thought and life of the Christian Church. (i) Do we not need to lay stress on the Divine activity in human illumination, inspiration, and sanctification, the development of human personality in religious experience and moral character? Is there not an added promise and potency in that development when it is realized as not man's achievement merely, but as also God's endowment? That God comes into immediate contact and intimate relation to man in enlightening his mind, quickening his heart, and strengthening his will, enriching his whole life, is a truth too precious to be neglected. A Divine immanence, personal in character and operation, is by this doctrine asserted, which avoids the pantheistic error of identifying God and man. Man does not become God, but God dwells and works in man to make man more like unto Himself. It is God's personal perfection as truth, holiness, love, which is emphasized, and His personal relation to

man; and thus the error is avoided of regarding all reality as in the same degree a manifestation of God, and so confusing the distinction of values which the moral conscience no less than the religious consciousness must maintain. Accordingly the tendency of mysticism towards pantheism is also arrested, and yet its demand for the most intimate satisfying relation to God is met. This immediate activity of God in man in bringing man into intimate communion with Himself is morally and religiously of higher value than would be absorption in God. The inwardness of religious life is safeguarded by this doctrine.

(ii) While the application of the science of psychology to the description of the psychical processes of this religious life is not only interesting, but valuable, since we enrich consciousness as we raise it to the level of self-consciousness; yet psychology carries the danger of reducing the whole process to a subjectivity, unrelated to any objectivity. The description of the mode may be regarded as an explanation of the cause. This peril can be averted only as we can make intelligible and credible the Christian conviction that it is God who worketh in us by His Spirit in what appears most really our own thinking, feeling, willing. There is a moral quality and a spiritual power in the Christian experience which gives assurance to the believer that he is not confined to his own reserves in his higher life, but can draw on the resources of God by His Spirit. The sense of dependence and the capacity to receive from God are so marked features of the Christian life that, unless an extreme scepticism declares that what man values most in his experience is illusive, the witness of the Spirit must be accepted.

(iii) All this may be conceded, and yet it may be contended that there is but one Divine influence, and that it is a theological subtlety to distinguish between what the Risen Christ does and what the Spirit. Of course, there is only one God, and the whole God is in every activity; but nevertheless we may apprehend that activity under different aspects. We do distinguish the Divine transcendence and the Divine immanence, but do not separate them from one another; it is the transcendent God who is immanent. In this immanence the Divine revelation itself, as recorded in the Holy Scriptures, has taught us to distinguish the more objective and the more subjective aspect—God objectively manifest in Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord, and God subjectively experienced as the Holy Spirit enlightening, hallowing, renewing. It is a safeguard against an unsound subjectivism to distinguish what is thus objectively manifested, the historical reality of Jesus diffused and continued in the Living Christ, and what is subjectively experienced, and to be always testing the subjective by the objective, so that we shall not ascribe to the Spirit anything in ourselves which is not Christlike. The activity of the Spirit is to realize in human experience the Divine revelation and human redemption in Christ. He is not visibly, audibly, or tangibly present; but His presence is made real to faith by the Spirit's inward activity. The Spirit so stimulates human receptivity that His truth can be ever more fully apprehended and His grace ever more fully appreciated. It is the Spirit who within the soul brings about the inward conditions for the universal and permanent presence and influence of the Living Christ. When as in the religious experience of Paul the Living Christ becomes as real as, nay, more real than, the things of sense, the Spirit's activity fulfils its end, and is merged in that consciousness. This experience is not equally attained by all; and many do not rise above a vague sense of Divine presence and power in their own religious experience. It is by the Spirit in all cases that God is present and active in men, and makes Himself manifest to them as man in Jesus the Christ.

(iv) On the ground of religious experience, theologically interpreted, making the implicit explicit, we are, it seems to me, necessarily led to the economic trinity. The orthodox formulation, three persons in one substance, tends to make the difference a division, and the unity unreal, and so easily passes over into tritheism. When we speak of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as *persons*, we must never think of *individuals*, as John and Paul were; when we speak of God as *one substance*, we must never think of a *class*, such as man, or beast, or bird. To speak of God as one *person* in three *modes* may not adequately recognize the difference in unity; theology has not yet discovered categories that will accurately express what we can think on this glorious and blessed mystery, disclosed but unfathomed. As psychology on the one hand and sociology on the other launch out into the deep of the essential relation between personality and society, we may discover conceptions of personality as essentially social and society as essentially personal which may enable us to say something which will be more and better than, as Augustine himself felt what he had said to be, a mere breaking of the silence. This is not the occasion for a speculative construction of the doctrine, an attempt at formulating an ontological Trinity;

but I would add that, for myself, I cannot think of God as personal, as truth, holiness, blessedness, and love without thinking of Him, not as a duality, for that leaves us with differences unresolved, but as a Trinity, for in that unity is restored. The Hegelian formula for the movement of thought, thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, is not 'a mare's nest' for thought; but a help to human thinking, even on the Divine reality of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, one God.

Literature.

AN INTRODUCTION TO NEW TESTAMENT STUDY.

Professor A. H. McNeile of Trinity College, Dublin, already well known for his scholarly work on the New Testament, has issued a new book which will enhance his reputation and at the same time earn for him the gratitude of students of theology. The book is entitled *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament* (Milford; 18s. net), and is a most serviceable manual, fresh, scholarly, and—for an Introduction—unusually comprehensive. It aims at showing in outline 'how the New Testament as a whole, and each book in it, reached its present form, when and where each acquired canonical authority, the chief problems which the study of them raises, historical, literary, and textual, and broadly what each is about and what it contains.' Thus it includes, besides the usual matter contained in an Introduction to the New Testament literature, an account of the growth of the New Testament Canon. There is also an account of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, and a discussion of the Inspiration and Value of the New Testament writings. The work is clearly arranged and clearly written, the standpoint is at once modern and conservative, and helpful guidance is given towards more extended studies. A valuable feature of the work, when considered as a students' text-book, is that on disputed points it records the chief representative opinions, with an indication of where the author's own sympathies lie. (For example, on the synoptic problem he is in sympathy with the 'four-document theory' urged by Canon Streeter.) Two quotations will serve to throw light upon Dr. McNeile's standpoint. The first is from his estimate of the Book of Acts: 'The historical value of the book as a whole lies, not in the verbal authenticity of its speeches, or the accuracy of the words or actions of the persons in the drama, or the exhaustiveness of its contents, but in the general picture which the author gives of the Christianity of the time, with its endowment of spiritual enthusiasm, the conditions under which it struggled, and its rapid advance from Jerusalem through a large part of the empire to Rome.' The second quotation is from his estimate of the Gospels: 'In no single sentence can we be entirely certain that we possess the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, even if it could be assumed that the Greek translations which have come down to us were always adequate. The variations in the reports of the same sayings in the different Gospels would alone be enough to render that certain. And yet we may feel confident that we possess to a considerable extent the real substance of them, because the substance of His words forms a large and indispensable factor in the production of the total Portrait which is required to account for the coming into existence of Christianity.'

DR. H. R. MACKINTOSH ON FORGIVENESS.

A new series of works, named 'The Library of Constructive Theology,' is being issued under the general editorship of Sir James Marchant, with Dr. W. R. Matthews and Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson as Theological Editors. Its aim is to re-state the great doctrines of the Christian faith from the standpoint of religious and Christian experience, as distinguished from a merely traditional acceptance of the authority of the Church or the Bible. It is a praiseworthy aim, and the Editors have done well in inviting Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.Phil., D.D., of New College, Edinburgh, to introduce the series with a volume on the central doctrine of forgiveness.

Dr. Mackintosh's volume, *The Christian Experience of Forgiveness* (Nisbet; 10s. 6d. net), might readily have been a complete outline of theology, such as many of us are awaiting from his pen. One recalls that Albrecht Ritschl's famous monograph on the cognate doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation was virtually a system of Christian theology. But Dr. Mackintosh touches but lightly on such

fundamental doctrines as those of Christ, Man, and Salvation, and even—relatively speaking—on the doctrine of God. What he gives here is a searching and intimate study, from various points of view, of the evangelical doctrine of pardon. And it rests upon the conviction that the chief thing Jesus Christ has done for the world is to mediate the forgiveness of sins and to impart the assurance of its reality. As the author says, 'The certainty of forgiveness in Christ is, if not the sum, at least the secret of the Christian religion.' Or, as he says again, in a challenging sentence, 'forgiveness of the kind received and enjoyed within the Christian fellowship is possible and credible only in view of Jesus.'

There is much in these pages that the preacher will find helpful. One recalls, for example, the chapter on the Moral Inspiration of Forgiveness, or the chapter on the Atonement (in which Dr. Mackintosh shows his sympathy with Moberly's theory). While there are historical discussions of St. Paul's and Luther's views on justification, the treatment is for the most part positive and constructive; and one cannot but admire the ability and skill with which Dr. Mackintosh builds up an argument which is at once intelligible to the general reader and worthy of the attention of the specialist.

CASUISTRY.

This elaborate treatise, *Conscience and its Problems: An Introduction to Casuistry*, by Mr. Kenneth E. Kirk (Longmans; 16s. net), written to vindicate the value of Casuistry (*nomen omen*), and to revive its general practice within the Anglican communion, is the third of a series which we owe to the diligence and zeal of Mr. Kirk. The book consists of two divisions. Part I. deals with conscience as a qualitatively distinct psychological fact. Then the obligation, in cases of conflict, of the individual conscience to the community—in this case to the Anglican Church—is considered, what the writer calls 'loyalty' as against 'liberty'—a better word than the Roman 'obedience' although less capable of definition. After dealing with the dubieties of the individual conscience as a practical guide, we are given an historical account of the phenomenon of casuistry in the Græco-Roman world (Stoicism) and in Judaism, finishing with a somewhat artificially schematized attempt to regard Jesus as a casuist of the right sort, and a treatment of Paul from the same point of view, which in many respects strikes a reader as the most unsatisfactory part of the whole volume.

Part II. deals with specific cases of conscience arranged under headings such as 'error,' 'doubt,' 'perplexity,' and illustrates these by such concrete examples as fasting before communion, clerical celibacy, birth-control, betting and gambling, the medicinal lie, strikes, etc. In each case an attempted solution is given on the writer's underlying principles.

The book is written with clarity and humour, and it is probably the best case which scholarship and fairness can make for a doubtful ecclesiastical practice which for its sins has been repugnant now for centuries to the general conscience of reformed Christendom. The author writes avowedly as an advocate, and readers will therefore remember the caution—'*ne nimio vini amore faeces bibamus*,' but they will not on that account fail to do justice to the scholarship and research of the writer, while they may find themselves making the following criticisms:

(1) The book is written on the usual Anglo-Catholic assumptions; and thus there is a total neglect of the value of some of the most vitalizing streams of Christian life. The authoritative dicta for the writer are those where Anglicanism and Romanism agree, which may be inevitable, but it robs the argument of much of its cogency.

(2) The author's attempted justification of true casuistry by trying to prove that Stoicism in its decadence elaborated cases of conscience, and that Pascal was misinformed as to the caveats of the Jesuits, does not carry conviction to the ordinary mind, for a practice is not justified by the caveats of its advocates, but by its broad human results, and it seems doubtful if casuistry will ever appear to be anything but just a subtle set of evasions of conscience. In this book itself, in any of the cases considered, one is as much in the dark as one was at the beginning of the discussion, for authority, rarely Scripture, is pitted against authority, and the conclusion is lame and halting—as in the nature of the case it must be. Even with as fair a mind as Mr. Kirk dealing with cases, we feel that conscience when perplexed is delivered from bondage not by *ex cathedra* guidance from without, but by a deepening of the spiritual life from within. This is the more excellent way.

THE CULTURE OF THE BABYLONIANS.

American devotion to Assyriology is eloquently attested by three sumptuous volumes for which Leon Legrain, D.D., Sc.D., is sponsor. He is curator of the Babylonian section of the Museum

of the University of Pennsylvania, and he has made magnificent use of the material at his disposal. Two of the volumes (£3, 3s. net) deal with *The Culture of the Babylonians*. In one volume this culture is described on the basis of Babylonian seals in the Collections of the Museum, while the other volume is devoted to exquisite reproductions of those seals. Dr. Legrain has made it his task 'to discover and set forth such facts concerning the art, history, and religion of Babylonia as are to be deduced from the engraved seals in the Museum collections, including the clay impressions that illustrate the use of these seals.' The seals come from Babylonia and the neighbouring countries, Elam, Assyria, Mesopotamia, Syria, and Cappadocia; they range all the way from about 4200 B.C. to A.D. 632, and we can thus trace the influence of successive invasions in introducing new symbols and new figures of the gods. Dr. Legrain has divided these five millennia into nineteen periods, and in a long prefatory chapter he gives a survey of the seals ascribed to each period. Each of the seals catalogued, to the number of 1088, is carefully described, and the descriptions can be intelligently followed in the beautiful reproductions which constitute the other volume.

The third volume, also edited by Dr. Legrain, and entitled *Royal Inscriptions and Fragments from Nippur and Babylon* (£1, 1s. net), contains fragments and some whole pieces which have hitherto escaped attention, and which may be regarded as supplementary to larger volumes of historical inscriptions already published. The inscriptions on vases, brick, stone, etc., associated with the names of kings, for example, Burnaburiash, Esarhaddon, etc., are reproduced in their original form, described, transliterated, and translated. These are volumes which no student of Assyriology can afford to neglect, and the first two would be of interest to the general student of ancient culture, even though he were innocent of Assyriology. All three volumes are published in this country by Bernard Quaritch Ltd., 11 Grafton Street, London, W.1.

DEISSMANN'S PAUL.

Professor Adolf Deissmann of Berlin, who combines great learning and careful scholarship with an un-German vividness of style, issued in 1925 a second and thoroughly revised edition of his study of St. Paul (first published in 1911, and translated into English in 1912 by Mr. L. R. M. Strachan). This new edition has been translated into English by Professor W. E. Wilson of the Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham—*Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History* (Hodder & Stoughton; 21s. net). What are the changes in the new edition? These are many, but the following salient points may be noted: (1) the translations differ in form, and Mr. Wilson has had the advantage of availing himself in places of Mr. Strachan's renderings. (2) The name of the Apostle now stands alone, both on the title-page and throughout the work, without the prefix 'St.' (in desiring this Dr. Deissmann was influenced by certain observations on Dr. A. S. Peake's part). (3) There is a section of new matter at pp. 114–122 of the revised edition, where there is a discussion of the idea of the cult (in its wider meaning of what lies behind the cultus as its spiritual precondition). As against the doctrinaire view that in the gospel we have to do chiefly with theories which Jesus held and theories about Jesus, primitive Christianity is regarded as a phenomenon in cult-history. (4) There is another section of new matter at pp. 147–154, where there is a discussion of the idea of 'mysticism' ('Mystik' not 'Mysticismus'). Just as in the former section a distinction is made between 'acting' and 're-acting' cults (Christianity, like almost all other cults, began as a reaction, as a response rather than a spontaneous thing), so in this section a distinction is made between 'acting' and 're-acting' mysticism. *Unio*-mysticism is also distinguished from *communio*-mysticism, and St. Paul is described as a re-acting mystic of the *communio* type. Perhaps we should recall that Dr. Deissmann's aim in his sketch of St. Paul is to present him in the first instance as a religious genius: 'The theological element in him is secondary; naïveté in him is stronger than reflection; mysticism stronger than dogmatism; Christ means more to him than Christology.'

THE FALL AND ORIGINAL SIN.

In our 'Notes of Recent Exposition' reference was lately made to the disturbing effects of modern Science upon traditional beliefs. On no topic, with the possible exception of prayer, has reconsideration become so necessary as upon the doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin. A really big book on this subject has long been needed, and here at long last we have it—*The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin*, by the Rev. N. P. Williams, D.D. (Longmans; 21s. net). It is the kind of book which it is hardly fair to review until after lengthy study, but we are

so impressed by a first perusal that we feel it our duty to bring it to the favourable attention of our readers at the earliest possible moment. We are convinced that Dr. Williams has given us a great book. He deals with a difficult and highly important topic in a great way, and thanks are due to his publishers who have allowed him the space his subject demands.

The treatment is historical, critical, and constructive, and in all those aspects it deserves, and we are confident it will receive, the highest praise.

In view of the now generally accepted views of man's origin and early history, in what form can a doctrine of the Fall be held? Has it simply to be given up as mythical? Is 'Fall' to be interpreted, on the principle of *lucus a non lucendo*, as a Rise? Here, in brief, is how Dr. Williams conceives a now tenable form of the doctrine. The Creation was originally purely good. Prior to the appearance of man, Evil originated in a voluntary rebellion of finite wills. Man, when he appeared, was morally and spiritually a babe, imperfect, ignorant, and non-moral, but with a capacity for progress. The growth of his moral ideas brought in its train some action whereby he aligned himself with the rebellious power. Ever since, human nature has displayed an inherent moral weakness or a bias toward sin.

That this will command general agreement in all particulars, we do not presume to forecast, but, worked out as the author works it out, we do say that the view deserves very earnest attention.

Specially valuable all through are the Notes, the Appendices, and the collocation of confessional statements.

SEVEN DAYS WITH GOD.

The author of 'The Syrian Christ,' etc., Mr. Abraham M. Rihbany, has given us another thought-provoking book, *Seven Days with God* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). It has a vital subject: its style is never torpid but always alive. The openings of its various chapters are immediately arresting; all through the reader has to think. Sometimes he may dissent, occasionally he will feel a need for definition, now and then he will put a confident question mark; but he will think.

The starting-point is that we have been over-accentuating the depth of the cleavage between East and West. Mr. Rihbany has never a doubt that a real difference between the two exists. The East is more religious, more quietist, more mystical: the West more 'practical,' that favourite Western ideal, more hot and fussy, more materialistic. Its so beloved social gospel, for example, 'objectified in a host of organizations,' sums up not inaptly 'the very things against which the Hindu sages warn all seekers after God.' To them we seem to be suffering acutely from 'a pestilence of improving others.' None the less we are not ranged a mass all of one type over against a mass all of another. Human nature is common to us both; and we are all the children of one age. Non-churchgoing, for example, is not a Western peculiarity; yonder also multitudes are turning from the practices of religion. While on our side, our 'top-heavy civilization has a spiritual substratum' and mysticism keeps breaking in on us, and we are more religious in essence than we know. Mr. Rihbany emphasizes this. For it seems he has discovered a sense of depression in America, a feeling that we Occidentals are not cut out for religion and need not try. We have not been given the gift. Mr. Rihbany is very kind to us. He pats us encouragingly on the back; he bids us cheer up; he assures us we also have a soul and our contribution to make to religion. He reminds us that although the great faiths all spring from the East, we have been 'creative borrowers' and can be so still. He looks with a large, fatherly, good-natured tolerance upon our faults, because we are so very young and undisciplined, and have never, it seems, had to pass through a Gethsemane as yet. Indeed, we have so much about our youth and the general new made-ness of the West, that one recalls Carlyle's musing over the burn at his Scottish door, how it too had been running there as long as the most famous streams of history in far-off lands. Still, says our author, you are not carrying your religion with you into life; you are 'reducing God to a small stockholder in the enterprises of Civilization,' you are abandoning much to other powers as having nothing to do with Him. Yet you must live your seven days a week with God; and he proceeds in thoughtful chapters upon prayer and life to tell us how to do it. There is a heart-searching passage on the lack of self-sacrifice in the lives of Western preachers; and therein, we are told, lies the true secret of their inefficiency. An interesting book, but is it necessary in a work printed in Britain to be irritated by occasional American provincialisms in spelling?

PAUL THE JEW.

Imaginative sketches of the life of Jesus, 'By an Unknown Disciple,' won many readers by its verisimilitude and bold adventure. The writer of

that popular work has followed it up with another on *Paul: the Jew* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). It is the story of Paul's life before he became a Christian, or rather it is a story of the last phases of that stage of his life. It is not history, it is not biography, it is a story in the strict sense, a tale, purely imaginative, based, it is true, on an accurate knowledge of the geography of Syria, and also based on a considerable knowledge of historical conditions and religious realities of that time, but a story all the same. The only 'real' characters that are introduced are Gamaliel and Barnabas. The latter is one of the most attractive figures in the tale, introduced with real art, and set before us with all the charm that is suggested by the facts of the apostolic history. The fictional characters are an Egyptian, a Greek, some minor Jews, and Paul's father, a very unattractive person. 'Every memory of his father withered and pinched the soul,' we are told.

The whole action of the story passes in the course of a journey Paul is making. But the real skill of the book, and its real contribution, is the way in which in episode after episode Paul's unrest and dissatisfaction with his own religion are suggested. We are not brought as far as his conversion, but no reader of this book could fail to see—in his contact with this one and that, in his brooding over his own failure, in his disgust with what he saw of Judaism in its home, in his arguments with strangers, and especially in the glimpses he gets from Barnabas and others of what Jesus was, and taught—how through all this Paul was being prepared for the inevitable change in his religious outlook. The book might be described as an imaginative commentary on the Lord's words: 'It is hard for thee to kick against the goad.' It is a fascinating and absorbing tale, and not without a very real religious value. By the way, 'Paul' is the name used throughout, by his companions as well as by his father and Gamaliel. But his real name was 'Saul' at this stage. At least among his own people it would be 'Saul,' though to the outside world his Roman name might be given. This is the only detail that can be said to be untrue to fact.

KRISHNAMURTI.

Most people are aware that, in the confident belief of his followers, one of those rare World-Teachers, whose comings mark the opening of new epochs, has arisen and is now living and teaching in this prosaic and material age of ours. Long foretold, eagerly expected, he is now veritably here, building the new world altar which is to supersede all others, leading us into a fuller faith.

A little book of what Krishnamurti has been teaching to his circle of devotees in the Castle of Eerde in Holland has been published by Messrs. Allen & Unwin under the title of *The Kingdom of Happiness* (3s. 6d. net). Obviously, if the claims put forward by his followers are valid, this is by far and away the most notable happening in our time, aye, and for many centuries, certainly since Muhammad at the very least. For it is the mighty prophets of the new faiths that sweep the world that make by far the deepest mark upon humanity. Yes, only this is not one of them. Mrs. Besant, indeed, in an ecstatic sentence or two of introduction declares, 'Readers will recognize the depth of wisdom, the striking originality, the exquisite diction of this really wonderful book.' And if you don't agree with her, she is too sure to be worried by a trifling thing like that. 'The wise will prize it; the other-wise will do as they please.' And in truth it is a beautiful and impressive little book. But probably what most will see in it is just a clean and earnest soul to whom spiritual things are the real things, himself loyally following with a certain joyous carefulness that voice, obedience to which he urges so insistently on others, eager to share with every one that to which he feels he has himself attained; and very certain of its value. For the rest, to those who know the real Masters (to Krishnamurti himself Buddha is 'the greatest of humans'), the book is somewhat elementary, at places rather thereby ordinary, beautiful in parts, and with the stab of an arresting, even haunting, passage every now and then. But of the unmistakable note of the authentic prophets there is never a sound, unless it be in such a challenging sentence as, 'This is not the place to seek new labels, to satisfy personal vanities; this must be the place where each should live as dangerously as he can, as forcefully as he can, as adventurously as he can, according to this eternal Law.' A fine little book.

THE JEW AND CHRISTIANITY.

What has been the attitude of Judaism and of Jews to Christianity during the centuries? How does Christianity appear in the gauge of Jewish literature during that period? These questions are answered in a very interesting book by Dr. Herbert Danby, Residentiary Canon of St. George's Cathedral, Jerusalem—*The Jew and Christianity:*

Some Phases, Ancient and Modern, of the Jewish Attitude towards Christianity (Sheldon Press ; 3s. 6d. net). We get here some characteristic glimpses of Jewish-Christian relations at different times and in various parts of the world, beginning with the first century, and including the nineteenth century and the present day. The earlier story is not a pretty one for Christians to read. The moral of it is that the judgment of Judaism on Christianity is just. The Jewish attitude to our religion has varied with almost mathematical certainty according to the degree in which Christians have shown themselves real followers of their Saviour. And in earlier ages nothing in Jewish hatred could be called excessive when we remember how Jews were treated by Christians. The book becomes intensely interesting when we come to modern Judaism, and the attitude of Reformed Judaism and of modern orthodox Jewish leaders. Is there any sign of a rapprochement between Judaism and Christianity? Read these two last chapters by Dr. Danby and you will have material to answer the question.

LATIN COMMENTARIES.

Professor Alexander Souter, M.A., of Aberdeen University, has found in the earlier Latin Commentaries a fruitful field which is peculiarly his own. Those commentators have been neglected, and, as is here pointed out, afford ample scope for scholarly investigation. This volume, *The Earliest Latin Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul* (Clarendon Press ; 15s. net), begins with a very interesting Preface, in which the author explains how this great and practically unoccupied field of study came to engage his attention, and sets forth his views on the Pauline Epistles. He regrets that he has had no specific theological training, but the reader will conclude that this 'treatment of a Latin scholar passionately devoted to St. Paul' has not suffered from that defect.

The Commentaries dealt with are those of Marius Victorinus, 'Ambrosiaster,' Jerome, Augustine, and Pelagius. In each case the treatment begins with a brief account of the life and works of the writer, goes on to handle such topics as MS. tradition, date of composition, main features of the commentary, the Biblical text, etc., and ends with an astonishing monument of industry in a collocation of peculiarities of diction.

It is a kind of work of which scholarship in this country has too few to its credit. If considerable sections have an interest mainly for the scholar, there is none the less much which wider circles will find most interesting and profitable.

JESUS THE AVATĀR.

Mr. V. Chakkarai, B.A., B.L., remarks in his *Jesus the Avatār* (Christian Literature Society for India ; 1 rupee), that it is imperative that Indian Christians should study Church history, or else, instead of making a contribution to Christian thinking, they may waste their strength re-fighting old battles decided long ago. Apparently he wishes them to start off from the point at which the Western Church stands now. But with a mighty difference. For he believes that we have lost ourselves for centuries in dreary wastes of metaphysics. Our whitened bones marking that road should be a warning to those coming after us. And our recoil from that has not, he thinks, been altogether in the right direction, has landed us merely in a fondness for picturesque detail of the external facts of our Lord's life. Dr. Glover, for example, leaves him cold. 'We are charmed and entertained, but fail to get inside our Lord's mind. . . . If Dr. Glover had lived in the East with any Guru, he would have seen more of Jesus than the rustling of His robes and the make of the communion cup.' India, he believes, should be able to lead us back to the heart of things—to the Spirit of Jesus Christ. Our mistake has been that we have elected to begin with abstract theorizings about God and to argue from these to Christ, instead of with the living Christ and so from Him to God. Accordingly, setting out from that beginning, he feels his way among the deep things of the faith with a sure tread, telling us what the Lord means to Him.

An impressive little book, comfortably at home among the findings of the most recent scholars, and full of devotion to Christ—all the more impressive since it originally appeared as a series of articles in 'The Christian Patriot,' of which the author was editor.

All who have read the first volume of Radhakrishnan's *Indian Philosophy* will give an eager welcome to the second volume now published by Messrs. Allen & Unwin (25s. net). It is a large book of eight hundred pages, and each of them is packed with matter. Yet it is as interesting as it is scholarly, a real contribution that opens broad, plain paths through the wide jungles of the six great Brahmanical systems in which Westerners

are apt, losing their sense of direction, to go wandering round and round, hot and confused.

If any one wants to understand the thought of India down the centuries, here is a trusty guide. Whether he is dealing with the logic of the Nyāya, the intense, if somewhat cold, philosophy of the great Saṁkara, and the burning religion of that mighty soul Rāmānuja, whether he treats of the most abstract thought or the most passionate theism, there are the same knowledge, the same understanding insight, the same dependability. Professor Radhakrishnan is a remarkable teacher, lucid, thorough, fair. He has done us a notable service in these illuminating studies of the master minds of his country, and we are grateful. This is a most useful book.

A very persuasive book on disarmament has been written by a rising member of the Labour Party, Mr. Rennie Smith, B.Sc., M.P., *General Disarmament or War?* (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net). The earnestness, the intelligence, and the idealism in this appeal are all moving. The writer admits that general disarmament *by itself* will not bring lasting peace. He admits that what we may call a new heart is necessary. But he says that, without general disarmament, the institutions of peace are all of them insecure. The real difficulty, however, which all such appeals make is this. Take Russia. There is a government radically militant and military, and without any moral principles. Is the world going to disarm while this government is armed? That is the answer of plain common sense. Can you get Russia to disarm? and could you trust her to keep any covenant? All the same, every plea against war and for peace is worthy of all our sympathy, and, so far as it is possible, our support. Listen to Mr. Smith's burning and shining words, in any case.

Nowhere is the present trend towards religious co-operation more evident than in the mission field. A great impetus was given to this ideal at the Edinburgh Missionary Conference of 1910, and since then the methods of co-operation have been systematized, and (in Great Britain) have their centre to-day at Edinburgh House, London. A narrative of the growth of this missionary co-operation since 1910 has been written by the well-known missionary leader, Mr. Kenneth Maclennan, under the title *Twenty Years of Missionary Co-operation* (Edinburgh House Press; 1s. net). It is an admirable and stimulating story, told with the zest and skill of a practised hand. All interested in the missionary cause should possess this booklet.

There are many books on the Lord's Prayer. But there was room for another as good as that by Principal Edwin M. Poteat, *The Religion of the Lord's Prayer* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). Dr. John Hutton says on the cover of the book, 'a great little book. Some years ago we heard Principal Poteat speak on the Lord's Prayer. It was one of the great occasions such as refresh the soul even in the recollection.' These are perhaps words of extravagant praise. But the book deserves praise. It is unconventional, on broad lines, brings out rather the substance of the Prayer than comments on its phrases. The point of the book is that in the Prayer we have a creed, a view of God and the world, a programme for civilization and a programme for the personal life. The greatness of this creed, the splendid breadth of its horizons, the definiteness of its ethical implication, all this is brought out with few words, but sufficiently and suggestively.

From time to time weird books of a highly individualistic nature appear, compiled by persons of intricate intelligence, apparently with great mental labour and advocating theses of the most superlatively allegorical kind. Such a book is *Gnostic Scriptures Interpreted*, by Mr. G. A. Gaskell (C. W. Daniel Co.; 10s. 6d. net). So far as we can discover its drift, the idea seems to be that historical accuracy in the Gospels is a matter of no moment. Indeed, it is a folly to think of that. The real significance of the gospel history, as of all Scripture, is the Divine philosophy behind it. In this medium all the 'errors, defects, miracles, contradictions, and absurdities' which we find in Scripture are explained. The 'holy men' who wrote the Gospels did so under a Divine influence which 'invented and contrived the sacred story in such specific terms that it became a symbolism of the under-meanings.' We are informed that thus interpreted 'the Christian religion would renew its youth.' It would certainly reach its second childhood.

A popular work on the Apocrypha is welcome, and it has been written by the Rev. S. H. Mellone, M.A., D.Sc.—*The Apocrypha: Its Story and Messages* (Lindsey Press; 2s. 6d. net). Very few people know anything about these wonderful books which tell the story and reflect the religious views in the period between the Old Testament and

the New. They are part of the Roman Catholic Bible, and the Church of England has always retained them for edification, though not regarding them strictly as part of the Word of God. The severe Protestant view has rejected them altogether. This last attitude was intelligible so long as a narrow view of Inspiration was held. But it is more than time for the apocryphal books to be restored to their proper place, and any book that expounds their real meaning and value will help to this. As a matter of fact we cannot rightly understand the New Testament without some understanding of the forces at work in the four centuries before Christ, and these are exhibited for us in books like the Maccabees, Ecclesiasticus, and Esdras. Dr. Mellone has given us in this book, not a dry commentary, but a racy history of these four hundred years, with illustrative extracts from the books he is using. It is probably the best method by which such books can be read, intelligible and interesting, and he has done his work well.

To know what Toc H stands for and what it is doing to-day, get *The Smoking Furnace and the Burning Lamp*, a group of sermons edited by the founder of Toc H—the Rev. P. B. Clayton, M.A., M.C. (Longmans; 4s.). 'Toc H is most definitely committed to the religious method. It believes that this is a law of spiritual as well as of practical hydraulics, that you must have a source higher than your tap. Ideals, we say, are rather like cheques. Cheques are quite useful commodities so long as there is something in the bank, but they are rather apt to be mere scraps of paper if the bank be empty. And ideals are just cheques upon the Bank of Heaven. . . . Toc H, moreover, is quite definitely committed to the Christian method. Its religion, quite frankly, is the religion of Christ and the religion of the Cross.' 'The heart may unite, but the mind must often divide. We cannot further unity by giving away our principles; for the principles are not our property. They are not ours to surrender. So in Toc H we do not affect, we do not even sanction, the transfer of denomination allegiances.' And again, 'The last bitter struggle of the nations, which has robbed this generation of so many of its rarest lives, was just a united conflagration of hatred and suspicion. And there is still enough of the inflammable in every one of us to repeat the blaze a thousandfold. The fires are still smouldering, too, not only between the nations, but also between class and class. A relentless alternative faces us to-day. Either it is going to be the Lamp of love and service and sacrifice, or else the old, old riot of selfish incendiary hate. This is the alternative that Toc H is seeking to set before the minds of the Churches and the young minds of the race.'

We have noticed lately the fact that books on the Holy Spirit are numerous at the present time. Another, and a very helpful and practical one, is *The Spirit of Glory*, by the Rev. F. W. Drake (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net, and 3s. net in paper covers). The main idea of the book is that ordinary life can be glorified by the ministry of the Spirit. Under headings like 'Sacrifice,' 'Sympathy,' 'Comfort,' 'Sacrament,' 'Fellowship,' it is shown in a series of suggestive meditations how life is lifted up by the help of this unseen Advocate. The chapters are marked not only by devout feeling but by penetrating insight. It almost seems that when men write about the Spirit they acquire a fresh liberty and power. And any one who (like Mr. Drake) loves to write about the Spirit is very near the centre of things.

Every one feels that if Christianity is to win India it must not come as an alien thing difficult to comprehend, but be related to Indian thought. Yes, but that has been so various and many-hued that it becomes a problem which of the endless strands should be selected with which to weave the native Christianity. Dr. A. J. Appasamy is quite sure that it is a mystical type of Christianity that can alone appeal to his people as a whole, and that the mystical union must be a central doctrine of the coming Indian faith. He seizes on the famous Bhakti literature in which such passionate love for, and such uttermost fellowship with, the Divine has been expressed, often so movingly, and, declaring that the Fourth Gospel is a pure bit of Bhakti, and so certain to hold a great place in the coming Indian Church, he enters on an interesting discussion of not a few of its central tenets, showing how near of kin these often are to the yearnings and findings of the deepest of the Indian poets and saints. Indeed, parallels strikingly close abound, like this from a Tamil poet, 'the ignorant say that love and God are two. No one knows that love is itself God. Whoever knows that love itself is God shall rest in love, one with God.' Yet he admits Johannine Bhakti has a sanity and balance that the Indian type lacks, and adds something very deep and moving. There are, of course, exceptions, but 'neither the idea that God suffers, nor the idea that we suffer with Him, has really found a place in Hindu thought.' And this

apparently raises real difficulty in the Hindu mind about the Cross and what it means. For Divine love reaching out the length of, say, sacrifice is not a natural thought to it. So Dr. Appasamy, in his book *Christianity as Bhakti Mārga: A Study in the Mysticism of the Johannine Writings* (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net), feels his way through the great Johannine tenets—Love to God, Love to Man, Flesh and Spirit, the Purpose of Prayer, the need of a Sense of Awe in religion, and the like. And if, as a rule, he finds these linking on easily to his own people's thinking, he casts many a new light on them for us.

Primitive Man: His Essential Quest, by Mr. John Murphy, D.Litt. (Milford; 15s. net), is an erudite and handsome volume. The quest, so one discovers, is for unity. And Dr. Murphy, holding up that thought like a torch in a dark cave, reveals many things that are impressive and arresting.

Interesting facts and speculations meet one everywhere. Why do we play games? Apparently because from the beginning 'to act is for man easier than to think,' and still when fatigued by mental effort he finds rest 'in muscular movements of his animal body'; while the trek to Rome, and the Protestants' 'extravagant emphasis on the authority of Scripture,' are both survivals of the primitive state of mind that loved and loves to avoid mental fatigue by sheltering under something stable and fixed. The book travels far. Here are discussions on many things—taboo, magic, beliefs as to the future, and much else. It is an interesting work, that holds the mind. But we have found it not always easy to follow or to feel the flow of the main argument among the various interests of the various pages.

It is superfluous at this time of day to commend the work and the reports of the *Palestine Exploration Fund*, which are invaluable to every one interested in the Holy Land. The latest volume (P.E.F., 2 Hinde St., Manchester Square, W. 1; £2, 2s. net) deals with the excavations on the Hill of Ophel, Jerusalem, which were carried on in 1923–25, first under the direction of Professor R. A. S. Macalister, and latterly by the Rev. J. Garrow Duncan. The vivid narrative, which is profusely illustrated throughout, gives one an admirable idea not only of the miscellaneous objects which rewarded the search of the excavators, but also of the difficulties which beset all such excavation, and of the ingenuity necessary to divine the meaning of objects and appearances which may at first appear to have no particular significance. The excavation seems to have definitely settled that the 'City of David' was on the Eastern Ridge, between the Tyropœon Valley and the Kidron. There are twenty-six plates and no fewer than two hundred and seventeen illustrations, which lend much animation to the text.

What is polarity? After writing a book on the subject, *The Theory of Polarity* (Putnam; 7s. 6d. net), Mr. Geoffrey Sainsbury seems unable to define it concisely or clearly. It is, however, that kind of opposition which we find between the sexes, or between barbarism and decadent civilization. On both those topics the author has much to say that is illuminating and suggestive. When he goes on to discuss knowledge and values, and attempts to make a philosophy of polarity, he leaves us bewildered and slightly amused. He is essentially a positivist, but here and there he might be called pragmatist, pantheist, dualist, materialist, and even atheist. When a writer is all that within a few pages, it is fairly obvious that his views can scarcely be called a philosophy. But the cleverness of it and the multitude of happy epigrams make the book a joy to read.

There is a series of books dealing with the wonders and achievements of science and industry in all their branches, books as fascinating as any one would imagine, and the most recent is *The Romance of our Wonderful World* (Seeley, Service; 6s. net). It is by Mr. P. J. Risdon, F.R.S.A., and tells the story of the earth's beginning and of the tremendous forces that have transformed the once flaming gases into the world of to-day. There are thirty-six chapters, and almost everything you want to know about is dealt with—rocks, the sun, the atmosphere, the sea, earthquakes, heat, light, sound, X-rays, coal, radio-activity, the solar system, and much else. There are thirty-four beautiful illustrations, and everything is told in a simple and fascinating style. In the formal sense this is not a religious book. In the real sense it is penetrated with religion, and it would be difficult to find a book of apologetics more calculated to arouse that wonder which is the mother of religion. Here is a book for the mind of inquiring youth.

A new and scholarly English edition of the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius has long been a desideratum. We welcome very cordially the first volume of a work which promises to prove of outstanding merit, *Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea: The*

Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine, translated, with Introduction and Notes, by H. J. Lawlor, D.D., Litt.D., and J. E. L. Oulton, B.D. Vol. i. Translation (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net). As indicated, this volume contains only the translation. We shall deal fully with the work as a whole when the second volume with Introduction and Notes is in our hands. Meanwhile let us say that the translation is excellent. Eusebius is not easy to translate into smooth English. But the authors have accomplished the task, with all its difficulties, successfully. The footnotes are exceedingly valuable.

We are indebted to the Rev. H. Curtois for a piece of useful work in *The Conversion of the English* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net). In this book the author has given us the substance of Bede's 'Ecclesiastical History,' in a popular form, and without some details and elements more interesting to the scholar than to the man in the street. In other words, he has given us the story of the Church in England in its earliest stage as told by one of its most interesting chroniclers. The work is very well done, and the interest is greatly increased by a large number of illustrations and four excellent maps. We commend this 'immortal story' of the planting of the gospel in England. It would enrich both Church and school libraries, and ought to find many readers in and outside the Church of to-day.

In the end of 1925 a Commission on Christian Healing was appointed at the General Convention of the Episcopal Church of America. One outcome has been the preparation by two of its members, a priest of the Church and a leading physician—A. J. Gayner Banks, M.A., D.S.T., and W. Sinclair Bowen, M.D., F.A.C.S.—of a manual of devotion for those who care for the sick. The title is *The Great Physician* (London: S.P.C.K.; 5s. net). It contains offices for the Healing of the Sick and for the Ministry of Absolution, An Order for the Anointing of the Sick, and a Form for the Laying On of Hands. There are prayers for Sleep, for a sense of God's Presence, for Cleansing of the Heart, for Healing, and for Courage. The whole has been compiled with care, insight, and a fine spirit of reverence.

We have received *The Problem of Evil and Sufferings: A Solution and the Antidote*, by Jeremiah Zimmerman, D.D., LL.D. (Stratford Co., Boston; $2.00). The solution offered is familiar—the possibility of evil is inherent in the bestowal of real moral responsibility on man; and by ignorance of natural law and by wilful rebellion man has converted possibility into actuality. So is the antidote—have faith, seek the Kingdom of God, and ever keep Christ. The greater part of this big book is just padding, much of it of an ego-centric, 'I'll-tell-the-world' kind. In the quotations from the poets, in the index, and in the grammar, there are several inaccuracies. In some of the statements too.

We have received three more numbers of 'Tracts for Better Times' (Teachers and Taught). They are an attempt to reinterpret the Christian religion for our day, and they come from a band of editors that represents all the Churches. Among them are Mr. Maltby, Mr. Reid of Eastbourne, Mr. H. G. Wood of Selly Oak Colleges, Dr. Lofthouse, Mr. Malcolm Spencer, and Dr. Raven. The new issue includes *The Omnipotence of God*, by the Rev. H. C. Carter, M.A., *The Grace of God*, by the Rev. J. Reid, M.A. (of Eastbourne), and *What is Prayer?* by Professor W. E. Wilson (of Selly Oak). The price is 3d. each. Nothing better could happen than the broadcasting of such excellent booklets.

The Parable of the Two Sons.

By Professor W. M. Macgregor, D.D., Glasgow.

'What do you think? A man had two sons, and to the first of them he said, Go, my boy, and work to-day in the vineyard; and he answered, Certainly, sir! But he did not go. Coming to the second, the father spoke in the same way, and got the answer, I do not want to; but later the lad changed his mind and went. Now which of them did what the father wished? The people answered, The latter. And Jesus replied, Be sure of this, that the worst of outcasts go into the kingdom of God in front of you.'—Mt 21^{28-31}.

This rearrangement of the story is preferred by scholars like Bruce and Westcott and Moffatt, both as resting upon first-rate MS. authority and as matching the facts of the moral record. God's

appeal for special service came to the law-abiding Jews before it passed out to Gentiles; to-day it speaks to people within the Church who acknowledge His authority before it goes to outsiders. The same order (the respectable coming first) appears in several of Jesus' parables; it is the older son who behaves prettily and stays at home, though in the end he comes out worse than the prodigal; the people of standing in the city are first invited and send their excuses, and then from highways and hedges guests of all sorts are brought in; and again, it is only when the tenants in actual occupation of the vineyard have proved recalcitrant that others are called in to give the landlord his share of the fruit. Wellhausen pleads that, but for the blunt refusal of the rude son, the father had no need of turning to the other; but that is based on the unwarranted assumption that only one pair of hands was required. So, on the whole, I take it as probable that this was the original sequence.

But what of the people's reply? The famous Cambridge Codex D, always independent and often audacious, represents them as defiantly answering that the polite son did best. Every one knows how readily confusion arises in the telling of a story through the use of 'the former' and 'the latter'; and it is possible that nothing more than this lies behind such an eccentricity of judgment. But, if we take it seriously, we must understand the people as declaring their view that the supreme duty of a son is to be respectful to his father, and that no belated obedience can ever atone for failure in this. Or else we may take it as a mischievous attempt to throw Jesus out in His argument. Nothing is more baulking for a disputant who is going to base a fresh appeal on what he counts the inevitable reply to a question which he has put than to have another answer thrown at him. Wellhausen is convinced that D has in this preserved the original form of the story, and that it was the cynical perversity of their reply which drew from Jesus the stern words that 'publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God in front of you.'

Whatever our view may be of the arrangement, there is no question that the Parable was designed to exhibit Jesus' judgment as to the things which matter in religion. At all times He was impatient of merely pious words—of saying, Lord, Lord, and not doing the will of His Father. Once, at table with Him, a smug person with the full vocabulary of piety exclaimed: Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God! and Jesus retorted with the Parable of the Feast and the guests' excuses, as if to say: My dear man, are you quite sure that, if you had the chance, you would care to go to that table? A sentimental woman effusively cried out one day, How blessed a lot to have been the mother of such a Son! and drew down on herself the austere reply: It is much more blessed to hear the Word of God and keep it. There are men, He said, who 'for a pretence make long prayers,' and they 'receive a greater condemnation.' That was His habitual estimate of values; but it was His delightful gift to present His teaching not abstractly but in the form of pictures, so here in half a dozen lines He depicts what is worthless and what is vital in religion.

There was a household with two boys in it, the older of whom was faultless in his manners. At any hint from his father, he would hurry off, eager, as it seemed, to do what was required. In the parable itself he utters only the two words, '*I, sir*': *i.e.* you certainly may count on me; but nothing was done. Perhaps he never meant to do anything: perhaps his memory was short and, distracted by other interests, he forgot: perhaps his purpose was never very stalwart, and the prospect of a scorching day inclined him to keep in the shadow. In any case, his graceful deference to the old man was the whole sum of his obedience. The other lad was of a different make—surly and boorish. If he had plans of his own he was not inclined to lay these aside to suit his father or any one else. And yet beneath that prickly exterior there was a heart and a sense of decency, so, as he passed the vineyard wall to join his friends, he changed his mind, flung off his cloak, and fell to work. The types are familiar in every society and age. It would be grossly unfair to imagine that all Pharisees were pretenders, for many, like Paul himself, were quite terribly in earnest in their obedience; but the kind of Pharisee that moved Jesus with disgust was a person whose manners towards God were perfect, who had always at command the appropriate word, the becoming gesture, the suitable tone. No one could behave more decorously in Temple or Synagogue, and as a churchman he was irreproachable; but in other relations his credit did not stand so high. Jesus thought of a poor widow whose cottage had stood on a corner of that man's land till she was harried out of it by his exactions. The cottage and its enclosure had disappeared, and the woman was hiding somewhere with a sore heart. Her pious neighbour had devoured her house, which to Jesus seemed of much more account than all his elaborate courtesy towards God. At the other extreme, Jesus, who noticed everything, observed a man

who had never given any promise of goodness, a girl extravagantly fond of fun and sweetmeats and kisses, without a thought of how much they might cost her. Wild blood was in them, which made them instinctively reply 'I will not' to any voice of authority. The world has always had this tribe of the regardless; and with joy of heart Jesus saw many of them turn right round and make a fresh start—sinful women sobbing at His feet and publicans crying to God for mercy. They had begun badly by denying the authority of their Father, yet some of them who had been last had come to be first—the most loving and loyal servants whom Jesus had. Jesus thus sought to make the contrast clear between those who are complete in the formal requirements of religion, and who rest there, and others whose record has been blotted but who now are loving and serving without stint; which of these, He asked, has got hold of the substance of religion? When the question is thus nakedly presented only one answer seems possible; unfortunately it seldom arises nakedly, but comes veiled and obscured by certain customary delusions.

The most obvious of these is the *delusion of form*. A man who knows how things ought to be done and who sticks to every detail of the procedure is apt to imagine that nothing more can be asked for. That is what outsiders often complain of in Government departments, what Dickens scarifies in his account of the Circumlocution Office. He saw before him a pompous organization, where everything was carried through with minute correctness—applications were filed and schedules passed on from department to department, and he denounced it as a pretentious and costly futility. Its formal completeness actually stood in the way of getting anything done. But the man living in that system, who knew how many letters had been written, how many circulars had been issued, how many appeals had been disposed of, was blinded by his very busyness to the uselessness of it all. A foolish lad wishes, as he says, to be a gentleman, which is a worthy ambition, if, as Louis Stevenson says, 'A gentleman is one who is dead to self'; but it is not in any such direction that most people look. And our candidate for this promotion gathers hints from his school, his companions, his tailor as to what he should wear, and say, and do; and having acquired what is of the surface he is content, without wasting a thought upon what lies below. The form contents him. This formalism runs through every part of life, and in religion it thrust itself upon the sense of Jesus. When the Pharisee in Christ's parable ran over the chronicle of his good deeds, it is likely that he was accurate in every detail: he actually did fast twice a week, he did give tithes of all he got—so what more could God ask for? The blamelessness of the surface left him with no anxiety about defects lurking behind. It is easy to brand such men as hypocrites, but it is scarcely fair, for the conscious hypocrites are always few. Nothing is rarer than for a man to stand naked before his own soul, and see himself as he is with all excuses and pretences torn away. The smiling youth who promised to work and did not would meet his father at night with the most fluent explanations, and would count the old man most unreasonable if he still seemed angry. For to him the forms of deference counted for everything. So Jesus sternly asks, Do you think God is as blind as you are to the vacancies in your deeper nature?

Even more insidious than the delusion of form is the *delusion of sentiment*, against which few of us are wholly proof. A book lays hold of you so that, before you sleep, you must know what the end is. Whilst you are reading, you seem to keep step with the hero in his course of daring and sacrifice; with him you face all risks, and your heart goes out to what is generous and gallant. But you come out of the trance not heroic, but tired and a little cross. The attraction of such a book is that it carries you into another world of feeling without any effort on your part, and it leaves you with a flattering sense that you are in sympathy with what is courageous. That may often be a mere debauch of sentiment, tending to make your character poorer, since sentiment has taken the place which action ought to have taken. By his convincing passion Rousseau made fashionable ladies in Paris ashamed of their neglect of their children, and induced some of them to nurse their own babies; but his children, when they were born, were sent to the Foundling Hospital. His glowing sense of the dignity of motherhood enabled him to make converts, but he did not convert his own habits. Augustine Birrell remarks about Hazlitt that he found it easier to write splendid disquisitions on his father's character than to drop the old man an occasional line of greeting for love's sake. We may suppose that this older son in the Parable had real sentiments of affection and admiration for his father. He would have been ashamed if he had not shown him respect; and we must not call this mere hypocrisy, because in giving a thing a bad name we put it from us as some one else's vice; whereas the grave fact is that nearly every one is inclined to let a fine feeling stand in place of a generous action, and especially is this true of religion. Under the spell of a moving

preacher our hearts grow big and we feel fit for anything. It seems as if we were on the threshold of a larger life; and it may be so. In many it has been so. But Jesus sternly admonishes us that nothing is worth reckoning which does not find its way past feeling out to action.

I do not mean that emotion is a bad thing; certainly our Lord had no suspicion of it, if only it were sincere. Without reserve He accepted the offering of a life though the man who made it was excited and unlike himself. The sinful woman in Luke's story could not possibly gauge the stress of what was waiting for her in the city outside, where she was known only for evil, and she certainly would not always be in the same exalted mood. And yet Jesus took her at her word, for He knew that emotion is one of the driving powers of life, which must not be wasted but captured and turned to service. For more than a century in Scotland our religious history was engaged with the struggle between two types or parties—the 'Moderate,' so called, and the 'Evangelical.' The good Moderate laid stress on right behaviour and was a little shy of the sublimities of doctrine; he talked of diligence and honesty and sobriety and human kindness. But the good Evangelical, whilst not forgetful of these duties, was convinced that for the achieving of them some spring or inspiration was needed. The battle with vice was not to be gained by any amount of good counsel or even of manly effort. The world, as he saw it, was a lost world, and only God could save it. And thus he dwelt continually on an amazing mystery of condescension, of One who for our sakes became poor and endured the sharpness of death, and thus opened the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers. Moderate and Evangelical, in altered forms, are still with us; but even secular moralists have confessed that the Evangelicals have had much to say for themselves. There is not enough of impulse in a precept. It can point the way, it does not give strength to walk in it; and the admonition to a weak man to amend his life may be a sort of cruelty, as he feels that he cannot even make a beginning. Before he can hopefully try there must be set free in him some emotion of gratitude, or wonder, or love, or desire, such as in all ages has been stirred by the exhibition of Jesus Christ, 'with whom alone is strength to create goodness in the worst and to make the weakest strong.' Sick eyes all around the world to-day are looking with a sort of despairing hope at Him who was not content with gestures or emotions of pity but actually did something. He loved me, they dare to say, and gave Himself up for me. That has been for many the beginning of the end of evil habits; for from this point they enter on a new course of effort in which, since God is with them, they are not defeated.

In the Church of Jesus we have no need to be ashamed of feeling, but we do need to be ashamed of the feeling which is never yoked to service. Few people have not at some time longed for a better life, but what of that if they never attempt it? It is not enough, says Jesus in this Parable, to have emotions of reverence for God and His will, you must push on to action, you must enter on the way of obedience. For it is in obedience that the religion of Jesus finds its goal.

Present-Day Faiths.

Presbyterianism.

By Professor Archibald Main, D.Litt., D.D., Glasgow.

I.

There can be no doubt of the firm root which Presbyterianism has taken in the ecclesiastical soil not only of Europe but of other continents. An object-lesson on its greatness as a polity and tradition can be found in *The World Alliance of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System*, a society which furnishes an imposing array of churches, clergymen, and communicants. Undoubtedly, there are several varieties of Presbyterianism within the fold of that Alliance, and there may well be a danger hidden in the welcome which such a fold holds out to differing flocks; but it is obvious to every student of ecclesiastical forms of government that presbytery has a strong appeal to Protestant Churches in old and new countries of the world. Whatever may be its

credentials or its heritage it apparently satisfies many yearnings of Christian folk.

II.

The older text-books dealing with Presbyterianism usually, and not without a savour of glibness, distinguish between the three classic forms of ecclesiastical polity—the Episcopal, the Congregational, and the Presbyterian, though the first of the three was almost invariably called 'prelatic,' a name that is not now so much used as it once was. The Episcopal form of government, witnessed in the Roman and Anglican Churches, has well-known features such as recognition of the principle of gradation of ministerial rank and office of the diocesan episcopate, and of the radical distinction between clergy and laity. The Congregational form, on the other hand, denies any gradation either in office or in court of the Church, and maintains the theory that all ministers are on an equal footing, and that all congregations of believers are independent and therefore freed from any judgment of a higher judicature. In a sentence, 'the fundamental and distinctive congregational doctrine is the independence or spiritual autonomy of the individual Church.' The resolute presbyterian sees dangers in each of these polities, and makes the claim, not always modestly, that his particular form of ecclesiastical government avoids such dangers, and points out a *via media* that is not a compromise but is well founded on scriptural authority. It is fair to remind him that some writers have reckoned that Presbyterianism has realized the faults and not the virtues of the other ecclesiastical types. But that is an expression of a partisan position, for which little evidence can be adduced. In opposition to a prelatic form of organization, Presbyterianism subscribes to an equality of clerical status and the maintenance of a parochial rather than a diocesan episcopate, whilst it furthers Church government and discipline by the members of the Church through ordained elders whose function it is to rule. Such elders are representatives of the Christian body, but they are not mere delegates. Again, in opposition to Congregationalism, the presbyterian claims to place more emphasis on the unity of the Church, and he can point to a well-devised gradation of unifying ecclesiastical courts which have legislative, executive, and judicial powers.

Perhaps the most appropriate general definition of Presbyterianism is that given in an article contributed to Dr. Hastings' ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. It is: 'The name "Presbyterianism" may be applied in a general sense to that theory of the Church which aims at realizing its visible unity through government by presbyters, clerical and lay, such presbyters being set apart by their peers with popular consent, being all of equal status, and being organized for purposes of ecclesiastical administration into Church courts, which rise one above another in an ascending scale, from the congregational to the national.' That is a 'general' definition, and it should be supplemented in various ways, not the least important of which would be a reference to historical circumstances in the halcyon days of presbytery. Such a reference makes it easier for the spectator to see what is really the essence and not the accident of the polity. Many people are impressed by the gradation of ecclesiastical courts in the Presbyterian Church—by the kirk-session, presbytery, synod, and assembly—which F. W. Maitland called 'a concentric system of courts and councils of which Rome herself might be proud'; and they believe that Presbyterianism is government by those renowned courts. But, if we read the classic writings of Rutherford, Gillespie, and Baillie, who flourished in the golden era of presbytery, we shall see that the essence of presbyterian polity is government not by presbyteries but by presbyters—and that is an important distinction. In Scotland the matter has been discussed by theologians and ecclesiastical lawyers during the last three centuries, and few presbyterians would now cavil at the judgment of the late Dr. William Mair, an expert of recognized authority, when he wrote: 'The government of the Church as embedded in its constitution is presbyterian. This does not mean . . . government by presbyteries, but by presbyters, as distinguished from prelates.'

The Church of Scotland, as the mother of many presbyterian daughters, has some claim to be an exponent and guide of presbyterianism. Her history and her documentary archives are helpful in determining the essentials of the Church government of which she is a living advocate. From the Westminster Confession of Faith we gather that the Ministry is an institution of Christ. 'Christ hath given,' so the words run, 'the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God . . . and doth by his own presence and Spirit according to his promise make them effectual.' At the time of the Revolution Settlement, the ecclesiastical government was 'established in the hands of and exercised by these Presbyterian ministers who were outed since the first of January, 1661 . . . and such ministers and

elders only as they have admitted and received, or shall hereafter admit and receive.' To-day the doctrine of the Scottish Church, as is evidenced by its loyalty to its confessions and directories, lays it down that every minister of the Word is to be ordained by the imposition of hands, and prayer, with fasting; that preaching presbyters orderly associated are those to whom the imposition of hands appertains for the congregations within their bounds; and that in ordination the presbyters act with the authority of the whole presbytery (Church of Scotland Assembly Report, 1911).

It is an interesting and not irrelevant fact that the Presbyterian Church in Canada, in view of approaching union with other branches of the Christian Church, issued a statement regarding ordination to the ministry in which it declared that it is a 'part of the Catholic Church, is in historic continuity with the Church of Scotland, and its ministry is continuous with that of the Catholic Church through presbyters of the Scottish Church.'

Presbyterianism, then, has no mean view of the Holy Ministry, and is rightly jealous of its ordained presbyters whose high duty it is to preserve the true preaching of the Word, the true administration of the Sacraments, and a true discipline amongst an orderly and united body of Christian people.

III.

Presbyterianism has often been identified with Calvinism, and it is important to notice the exact relationship between the two. In what has been said about the three main types of Churches the principle of division has been one of ecclesiastical polity merely and not of theological doctrine. A Church might well be Calvinist without being presbyterian, and it might be presbyterian without any obedience to the form of worship prescribed at Geneva. There is Calvinist doctrine in the Thirty-nine Articles, though the Anglican Church is certainly not based on John Calvin's theory of Church organization. But principles of polity and doctrine act and react on one another, and it is an axiom that any form of Church polity must be based, in the long run, on a definite doctrine of the Church. Accordingly, we are not surprised that with some exceptions—and these are usually due to external factors—Calvinist doctrine, presbyterian government, and a simple type of worship go together. It is not too much to say that in modern times the presbyterian type of ecclesiasticism owes much to Calvin's doctrine of the Church, though it should be remembered that the Scottish reformers did not slavishly follow the lead of the Genevan preacher. Calvin's celebrated régime was moulded to suit the requirements of a municipality, but the task of Knox and Melville was the organization of religion for a nation. John Knox deemed Geneva the most perfect school of Christ since the days of the Apostles, but he and his followers did not permit their loyalty to the Protestant Rome to hinder necessary changes in their schemes or to prevent their adoption of expedients inspired by other branches of the Reformed Church. But in broad outlines the Scots reformers accepted Calvin's doctrine of the Church as a fellowship of believers bound together by the motive of realizing the fellowship of each member with his neighbour and of all with Jesus Christ the Head of the Church. They distinguished between the Church visible and the Church invisible. The latter is known only to God, and the former can be seen 'wherever we see the Word of God sincerely preached and heard, wherever we see the sacraments administered according to the institution of Christ' (*Institutes*, iv. 1). Such a spiritual theory should make it impossible for any presbyterian to unchurch a believer, and it is noteworthy that Calvin himself refused to go the length of unchurching Rome.

The sixteenth-century reformers who cast off their allegiance to the mediæval Church needed a paramount authority which should be the test and the inspiration of all their work, and that authority they found in the Word of God. An immense impetus was given to the study of Holy Scripture as the norm of faith and practice. It was natural, then, that Swiss, French, and Scottish reformers narrowly scrutinized Scripture for guidance in their search for a proper ministry in the Church. They were profoundly dissatisfied with the clericalism of the Roman Church, and sought in their reformation schemes to copy the tradition of the primitive Church in the days of the apostles. They knew that organization was necessary, and they looked for their model in the New Testament. Their search was rewarded, so they thought, in the 'presbyter.' Whether or no it was but 'old priest writ large,' it was the office they cherished as scriptural and therefore divinely inspired.

It is appropriate to make here a brief reference to two theories that are intimately connected with the reformers' quest after apostolic practice in Church government—they may be called, without serious injustice, inferences from ecclesiastical facts. The first is the 'divine right theory' of Presbyterianism, which in its usual form claimed

that presbytery is the sole form of Church government sanctioned by Holy Scripture and the institution of Christ. The seventeenth-century presbyterians made that claim and repudiated the 'expediency theory' of Hooker, but it was not long before the Anglican Churchmen took up an equally strong attitude regarding the divine approval of episcopacy. These were days when divine right was a sanction glibly claimed in politics, and the Stewart dynasty insisted in and out of season that monarchy in their persons had that right. The Presbyterians took strong ground against what they reckoned despotism, and they were convinced that their ecclesiastical polity had a divinity which they denied to their sovereigns' political pretensions. Sovereignty was a word to conjure with in that era, and the stout-hearted presbyterians claimed it for their Church's government, a government modelled on the Bible. But this theory of Presbyterianism is no longer held in its original form. Its wiser advocates are content to affirm that their polity is in keeping with the spirit of the New Testament and the Apostolic Church, they are agreed that neither presbytery nor episcopacy as we find them in modern days has literally matched the pattern of the early Church, they are content to adduce considerations of expediency in favour of their ecclesiastical practice, and they are willing to admit that questions of polity must not be made matters of dogma.

The second theory to which we make reference is that which insists on apostolical succession. Some presbyterian apologists make much of this, and they claim a *perpetua successio presbyterorum*. A discussion of the merits of such a claim would be out of place in this article, but it is important to recognize the motive lying behind the claim. Presbyterians do not admit that their Church began in the sixteenth century, and they have rightly insisted that the Reformed Church of Scotland (to take one example) is undoubtedly connected with the pre-reformed Church by its succession of presbyters. During the Eucharistic Congress held at Chicago in 1926 there was an exhibition of Catholic treasures to quicken and delight the interest of the faithful, and I remember one ecclesiastical chart which attracted much attention. On it were marked various lines which delineated the rise and progress of the branches of the Church throughout the centuries. A great, broad line started from the first century and represented the Roman Church, whilst a thin line beginning in the sixteenth century showed the history of the presbyterians. Now it is proper that presbyterians should insist on their heritage of the Christian ages. But we must distinguish facts of heritage from interpretations placed upon these facts—and therein lies the difficulty. It is not easy to determine what Knox and Melville believed in the matter of men and orders. They were engaged in the Herculean task of reforming a Church that had fallen on evil days, and it is asking too much of them to demand a matured ecclesiastical philosophy of orders. The fact that Romanist priests became presbyters without reordination points in one direction, but even more important are the assured facts that it was not a new but a *reformed* Church for which they laboured, and that everything was subordinated to the ideal of furthering the preaching of the Word, the administration of the Sacraments, and the maintenance of discipline amongst Church people. Polity is important in a Church, but godliness is the chief concern.

IV.

Every Church has its glorious pages of enterprise and fidelity, and not least has the Church of the presbyterians. It brings to the universal Church some characteristic gifts. In the first place, Presbyterianism has almost always fought the battle on the side of civic and religious liberty. The Scottish Church can furnish many episodes of daring in which her sons and daughters played worthy parts. The struggle in the seventeenth century between despotic kings and dour subjects was taken up whole-heartedly by the Presbyterian Church. In 1638 the National Covenant was subscribed by the great majority of the Scottish people, many of them signing it with their blood, and it was a compact to 'defend the true religion . . . and recover the purity and liberty of the Gospel.' That pledge was soon made good, and under the leadership of Alexander Henderson the Scots 'cast down the walls of Jericho.' No presbyterian Scot dare forget the heroism begotten of the Scottish Covenants, for by them liberty in Church and State was won at the cost of disunion, revolt, and martyrdom. The Irish presbyterians had their epic in the defence of Londonderry, for it was mainly due to them that the city did not fall before the soldiers of James II. The presbyterian, William Carstares, was true to the Scottish tradition of patriotism and the fear of God; and 'the cardinal' guided the destinies of the Church in the momentous days of Revolution. Many an incident could be recalled in which sturdy presbyterians took the side of civic liberty and were not afraid to fight for it to the death. An American writer has

recently written that 'the Presbyterian Church is constituted like a republic, and its courts have afforded effective training in the art of government. It has also taught, in a practical manner, how laws may be essentially preserved, while yet undergoing gradual change to meet new conditions.' That there is much truth in this statement can be seen by any student who knows the history of the General Assembly in Scottish history. This characteristic court of Presbyterianism was for years 'a true House of Commons' (as Lord Balfour of Burleigh once called it), far more representative of the Scots people than their parliament. 'Take from us the freedom of assemblies, and you take from us the Evangel. Without Assemblies, how shall good order and unity in doctrine be kept?' The question was asked by John Knox, and the answer is seen in history.

We must not say that Presbyterianism in its earlier days was democratic in the modern sense of that much-misused word, for some of the reformers were far from democrats. Indeed, John Calvin and Andrew Melville were aristocrats rather than democrats. But Presbyterianism, largely favoured by the middle-class population, evolved an apparatus of popular representation which undoubtedly gave much assistance to the rise of democracy. And in recent days the Anglican Church has indirectly paid a tribute to the worth of a presbyterian court by its erection of a national assembly. Presbyterianism, then, has a contribution to the Church in its historic and valorous defence of the rights of the people against oppression.

Another gift is its emphasis on the eternal value of 'principle.' One cannot refrain from feelings of sorrow as one recounts the story of Secession, not only in Scottish history, but in the narratives of Presbyterianism in other parts of the British Empire, and even in lands that should have been free from Scottish stubbornness. But there is another side to the picture. If presbyterians have been too apt to separate from each other, they have taught the lesson that tolerance in Church matters is not always a virtue, that there are times when it is proper and Christian to take resolute stand for doctrinal principles and ecclesiastical practice. It is not too bold a statement to affirm that no secession in Scottish history has failed to achieve some good to the Mother Church by a severe object-lesson in the need of emphasis on some forgotten principle.

It is perhaps a corollary of this insistence that the Presbyterian Church has never been wanting in its testimony of ethical probity. Its Calvinism, with its doctrines of election and free grace, might have been expected to imbue mankind with a sullen fatalism, but, on the contrary, it has bred a morality most active. We now smile at the Genevan and Scottish régime of ethics, and criticize the austerity of presbyterian practice in bygone days, but we must admit that his type of religion made the Scot and the Huguenot trusted in business, independent in judgment, and insistent in the cause of righteousness. If the presbyterian of the past was stubborn and not always easy to live with, he yet commanded the respect of his fellows for his honesty and his fear of God—if not of men.

Lastly, Presbyterianism has always stood for a high level of education. The reformers believed that the people should be educated in the interests not only of the Church but of self-government. John Knox gave an inspiration by his outline of what a cultured Scotland should possess in schools, academies, and universities. The *First Book of Discipline* remained an ideal, but the presbyterian at his heart is an insatiable idealist, and he has never forgotten the lead given to his forebears. Theological discipline has always been an integral part of the Scottish university system, and outside of it there have been renowned Divinity halls whose teaching staffs have always won the admiration of scholars. In Geneva, Lausanne, Belfast, Montauban, Paris; in Canada, the United States, and Australasia, a like story could be told. Presbyterianism has always treated education as her handmaid, for she has never despaired concerning the republic of learning.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Send them to Coventry and Farther.[1]

'Then went the devils out of the man, and entered into the swine: and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the lake, and were choked.'—Lk 8^{33}.

Away down in South America it seems they have been having quite a lot of bother with some people. There are not very many of them, but they are very noisy, and they won't let other folks alone; keep stirring up trouble and fuss and rows where everybody was quite happy. Don't work, they say; it's far pleasanter loafing about in the sunshine doing nothing. Why should you get as hot and tired as that? Don't pay taxes! It's nicer to hear the coins jingling in your pockets. Don't obey the laws! Why should you? Why not do just what you like? And at last the rulers yonder have got tired of this, and have hit on an idea. They have rounded them up, and got them all together; and they have said to them, 'Now, we aren't going to kill you, or imprison you, or punish you. But we are sick of you. You're a bit of a nuisance, and we have stood you long enough. Do you see that ship? Well, you're going on board her—oh yes, but you are—and we are going to leave you on an island, a lovely island, and there you can do whatever you like. It's a beautiful place, there are hills and woods and water on it, but it's hundreds of miles out of the track of steamers—it's quite near to Robinson Crusoe's island—and there you will be out of the way. If you don't want to work, you can starve. If you wish to make trouble, make it among yourselves, and fight it out among yourselves, till, like the Kilkenny cats, you have eaten each other up, and there's nothing left but the last yell dying away. Anyhow, you are not to stay here. So, be off with you!

That seems a good idea, doesn't it? I never saw it in our nursery, but lots of mothers use it. When you are in a bad mood, when you get up on the wrong side, when everything is amiss, when you don't want this, and don't like that, when you're cross if you lose, and horribly cocky if you win, when you keep spoiling everything, Mother at last gets tired of it, and she puts you in the corner, where you can twiddle your fingers and study the wallpaper till you know it by heart; or she takes you into a room by yourself—and, 'When you come to yourself we shall be glad to see you,' she says; 'but we're not going to be bothered any longer with such a crosspatch as you are just now.' And that soon mends matters, doesn't it?

Don't you think we might try that? For there is a whole mass of horrid things in your heart and mine that keep spoiling everything. There are sulks and crossness and bad temper and—oh, dear me, how many more! If only we could herd them all together, and push them on board a ship, and send them off for evermore! When a boat sails every one cheers, I don't know why. Lots of them are not happy at all, are feeling sore at heart at parting. Yet when the band of water shows and widens between the liner and the shore, every one cheers, wishing good luck to one another. But what a cheer we would send up if we could see that belt of water broadening and broadening between us and those horrid things, if we were done with them once for all.

It's a good scheme, only it doesn't work. For they won't go! Be off! we say. And they put out their tongues at us, which is very rude of them. But then they are horribly rude. They lounge about our hearts, and laugh at us. You come and put us out, my little man, they say. And that does it. For we know we can't. They are too strong for us.

Ah, but we have still a chance. Jesus Christ used to come on poor souls bothered by unclean spirits, and He used to say to those, 'Away!' And off they had to slink. For though they laugh at you and me, they are afraid of Him. Why, once He sent a whole herd of them rushing pell-mell, faster and faster, for they couldn't stop, into the lake, where they were choked; and a good end for them too. And what if He did that for you and me; sent all these horrid things rushing full speed out of our hearts for ever. If I were you I would say to Him: 'Here is a little boy or girl, who just hates the grumps and the selfishness and the—you know what—that keep spoiling everything; who wishes and wishes to be done with them, but they won't go. Please, please, dear Jesus, send them out of me, away, away, where they will never trouble any more.'

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

The Name on the Heart.[2]

'I will write upon him the name of my God . . . and my own new name.'—Rev 3^{12}.

It was not long after the death of the last of the apostles, and they had strange ideas then. Things

[2] By the Reverend J. T. Hudson, B.A., B.D., Hale.

that horrify us no one took any notice of. If you neglect a baby to-day, and some people are wicked enough to do it, you get into serious trouble. But in those days if you had a baby that you didn't want, and lots of people had, you just left it to starve to death, or for the dogs to eat, or you threw it into the river, and no one said anything about it at all. It was in those topsy-turvy days that an old man, the minister of the church at Antioch, was taken up by the police and condemned to death. They liked to have people condemned to death in those days, because people thought it fun to watch them being killed, and the more it hurt them the more those who watched liked it. And so, instead of killing this old man at once, they saved him up to be sent to Rome, where they killed people in the great open-air theatre by making them fight with one another or with lions and tigers and bears that they kept for the purpose. On his way to Rome this old man wrote seven letters of which we have copies to-day, and that is how we know all about it. His name was Ignatius, and we find that his only crime was that he was a Christian. You could throw babies away and nobody would touch you, but if you were a Christian, however good you were, they killed you if they could. Ignatius tells us that the ten soldiers who took him to Rome were very cruel to him; they were as cruel as ten leopards. But he says it was good for him to be treated badly, because it gave him a chance of practising the spirit of Jesus, and being His true disciple. He thinks it a great honour to be killed for Jesus' sake. Jesus had died for him, and now he is going to die for Jesus, and he says he is not half good enough for an honour like that. And he is very anxious that all his friends, and especially his young friends, should be true Christians. One of his letters is to Polycarp, the minister of the church at Smyrna. Polycarp was only young then: forty years later, when he was an old man, he, too, was put to death for being a Christian, burnt alive at the stake. Ignatius tells Polycarp that being a Christian needs as much training as being an athlete. The boy that wants to do well at the sports has to go in for a lot of training. He practises running or jumping constantly: he goes to bed early so as to get plenty of rest: he has cold baths in the morning and then perhaps an early run, and, whatever other boys do, he never touches a cigarette. He learns to be master of himself so that he may be able to win. And so Ignatius says to Polycarp, 'Be self-controlled as God's athlete, be steadfast like an anvil under the hammer.' In other words, 'If you are going to be a Christian, you will have to train.'

But there are two stories about Ignatius that I want to tell you. The first story is that he was one of the children that Jesus took in His arms when He was here on earth. Possibly this is true. Perhaps it is only a story made up to explain his other name, Theóphoros, which means borne by God. The story supposes that he was called Theóphoros because Jesus bore him in His arms. Of course, you say, if that story is true, he could not help growing up a good and brave man. But even if the story is true, even if he were one of the children whom Jesus blessed, he would not be any better off than any of you boys and girls, for every one of you, too, has been taken by Jesus in His arms and blessed. Really! I mean it! Were you not brought and christened when you were very young? You see only the minister take the baby in his arms in the christening service, but Jesus is really there, and really it is He that takes the baby. And He says, This child is Mine to be My true soldier and servant unto his life's end, and the parents have to promise to bring up the child for Jesus. And when next you see a baby being christened, just say to yourself, They are giving that baby to Jesus, and they are promising to bring it up to be Jesus' faithful soldier and servant. And that is what they did for me, so that I really belong to Jesus, and I have to carry out their promise and be His true disciple.

The other story is this. It was said that when he had been killed at Rome, they cut his heart out and found the name of Jesus written on it. Perhaps this story arose out of another pronunciation of his name. It can be pronounced Theophóros, and then it means, 'bearing God.' Of course it is not really true. But its meaning is true. For the story just means that people had only to look at Ignatius to see that he was like Jesus, fearless and strong, loving and true. When Ignatius was christened, just as when any child is christened, Jesus put His name on him. When a child is christened he is baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. But the name had sunk right down into Ignatius' heart, and every one could see that he belonged altogether to Jesus. Now that is why Jesus puts His name on us. Some of you know what Blackpool Rock is like. It does not matter where you break it, you find the same words, 'Blackpool Rock' throughout. Now that is what Jesus intends for every one of us. He intends us to be the same right through, so that it does not matter whether we

are at home or at school, in the classroom or in the playground, we are always found the same, like Jesus, fearless and strong, loving and true. Yes, that is why He puts His name on us. It is that it may be in us, running like red letters right through our life, so that no one can fail to see that we belong to Him. His name is on us and in us. And so every one who has been taken in Jesus' arms, borne of God, is intended to be God-bearing, intended to carry and convey God to the people among whom he lives. He is Theóphoros in order that he may be Theophóros.

The Christian Year.

Eighth Sunday after Trinity.

The Fellowship of Christ's Venture.

'Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with: but to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give.'—Mt 20^{23}.

James and John asked for fellowship in Christ's crown, and Christ promised them fellowship in His Cross. They desired a kingdom, and He proposed to them a quest. For what they had really asked, however little they understood their own petition, was companionship with Him who was even then on His way to give His life as a ransom. What Christ saw before Himself was the Cross, and what was His to give was fellowship with Himself, on His right hand and on His left, indeed, but on Calvary!

The laws of the spiritual Kingdom are the laws of common life. Risk is essential to human effort. Nothing is so uninteresting as an anticipated result, an assured victory, a mathematical conclusion. Where there are no possibilities of surprise there is no joy in success. The stubborn temper which can play a losing game is a much more valuable asset than the complacence which takes advantage of the swelling wave or floats to shore upon the glowing tide. The spirit that sends men out in search of adventures or urges them to hazard fortune and even life itself belongs to the noble side of human nature, and is necessary to the advance of nations. Nor is there anything more deadening to the creative powers of the race, more destructive of the faith of the peoples, than a determinism like that which filled the jaded imagination of the writer of Ecclesiastes. 'That which hath been is that which shall be; and that which hath been done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun.'

Nothing comes out more clearly from an attentive study of the gospel than the reality of the moral struggle in which the Saviour of the world engaged. The exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of the Father was not achieved without that element of risk which is the essential condition of all human success. If this is not so, then the human experience of the Son of God ceases to be a reality, and becomes a hollow pageant instead of a splendid triumph. For if the will of the worker is enlisted in the struggle, then before the event the issue must always hang in the balance. If from the first the spectator is assured of the result, it is because he trusts the skill, the endurance, above all the determination of him who is fighting his way to victory, not because the conditions of the game are so regulated that, as on the stage, the palm is already awarded before the struggle is begun. The Christ did not enter the field of earthly conflict like the god from a machine in the Greek drama who saves the situation by his irresistible might. The Resurrection is not a foregone conclusion when Jesus is born at Bethlehem. He must Himself achieve it, precisely as all the sons of men work out their own destiny, through peril and toil and pain. Every step of the road by which He climbs the steep ascent of heaven carries Him into an untravelled future. He speaks of His life as His temptations, and we cannot suppose that temptation is possible where there is no trembling uncertainty. The salvation of a world once hung upon the slender thread of one human will. Christ met Satan in the howling wilderness. In the garden His sweat was as it were great drops of blood. There could have been no human struggle unless before the Son of Man there opened two pathways; unless at those awful moments in His pilgrimage Christ, and with Him Christianity itself, stood at the cross-roads. We ask, Is there, then, uncertainty with God? How could the Son of God at any moment have stood between failure and success? This we cannot answer. The death of Christ proclaims Him very man, His resurrection marks Him off as Son of God. Here in itself is a paradox which thought can never reconcile. This need not disturb us, for it is no greater problem than that which our own existence presents. But just as we will not deny our own freedom of choice because we confess ourselves to be the workmanship of an Almighty hand, the result of a long development which science is attempting to read, so in contemplation of the Passion of the Son of Man our first demand is that it shall be real. What are certainties in the secret purpose of the Father are dependent on moral effort and are therefore glorious uncertainties so

far as they concern us in the revelation which He has made to us in the Son. It is because He overcomes that He sits down with the Father upon His throne. From beginning to end His career is the supreme venture of faith. Not by His exact knowledge of the future, but by His perfect trust in the Father, was the Saviour of the world sustained. He could commit Himself to the awful risks of the Passion because He abode in the Divine fellowship. 'I am not alone, for the Father is with me.'

It is into the communion of the Eternal Love that Christ calls His followers. 'Truly our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son, Jesus Christ.' To have given our troth to Him for better for worse, for richer for poorer; to have been initiated into the companionship of His home, to sit at His table and to drink out of His cup, to be permitted to go shares with Him in the perils of our earthly lot, to abide in His love even when it involves the fellowship of His sufferings, that is a kingly heritage for loyal hearts. 'Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee on the water.'

There is no more difficult art in the world than friendship. It demands a constant and unremitting activity of the whole personality if it is to issue in a trust that is beforehand with experience. You must be prepared to labour at the task day by day and hour by hour if love is to be the guiding principle of life. It is no slippered virtue, no lazy companion of the leisure hour. The genius of true friendship is an infinite capacity for taking pains. So with that most intimate bond of friendship which is the fountain of the race. And Christ never makes any secret of the demands which He imposes upon those who would come after Him. 'Are ye able to drink of the cup that I drink of, to be baptized with the baptism wherewith I am baptized?' It is a hard and not an easy thing to be a Christian.

'We are able.' What did it mean, this brave answer of the young men whose generous enthusiasm for the Master already placed Him on the throne, and who asked for nothing more than to sit as His assessors on either hand? What if the glamour in their eyes prevented them from seeing the wooden cross and the thorny crown. Still, it was Christ's throne that they would fain attend. It could not be that James foresaw the defeat of his expectation and the headsman's sword that was to be his portion. It could not be that John discerned from afar the rolling years which should carry from him one by one the companions of his youthful hope, and the lonely Ægean rock, and the vision of the saints beneath the altar who cried, 'How long, O Lord, how long?' Nay, the secret of the strange unfolding of the Lord Himself and not His throne was the true object of their love and loyalty. It is those who will take the risks of His service, who will trust themselves to the unknown because He goes before—it is they that will alone endure in the cloudy and dark day.

Christ's own triumph was only reached by a resurrection. He overcame death by submitting to it. He gained all only by losing all. He set out upon His mission because He loved the Father. When it meant the closing in of every prospect, the scorn and hatred of the men whom He had come to save, the melting of His hopes, the withdrawal of the Father's smile—He still chose the Father, because He alone was worthy of His allegiance. The joy in which He endured the Cross was the supreme joy of giving up everything for God. Into fellowship with that joy He summons us when He turns upon us and demands whether we are prepared to give up everything for Him.

But do not mistake the question. Many men decide that they are not able to make sacrifices for Christ, because they do not know whether they would be ready to confess Him under hard circumstances which their imagination pictures, but which, for all they know, may never arise. They refuse to keep tryst with their Lord at the Holy Table, because they do not know whether they will be able to live up to it. This is the sort of spirit which in any other department of life they would scout as unworthy of a brave man. Do they, for example, hesitate to embark their capital in business until they have made absolutely certain that there is no possibility of failure? Does the athlete refuse to enter for a competition until he has made perfectly sure that he can stand against all comers? 'Nothing venture, nothing have' is a proverb of universal application. Did Hannington anticipate the axe of the African executioner, or Williams his martyrdom in Eromanga? Was Peter wrong when first he left his fishing-boat to follow Jesus, because in the judgment hall of the High Priest he was to deny his Lord? No! These are the men whom Christ wants, the men of generous impulse and adventurous heart, who in the glorious faith of a surrendered manhood will dare to run the risk of the years. 'We are able'—the great response rings down the centuries, as it is caught up by fresh lips and expresses the eager loyalty of generous souls, who would count it an honour to attend His drooping pennon from the stricken field, and to whom in failure as in success He is and ever will be Christ the King.[1]

[1] J. G. Simpson, *The Spirit and the Bride*, 221.

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Gates on Every Side.

'On the east three gates; on the north three gates; on the south three gates; and on the west three gates.'—Rev 21^{13}.

When St. John saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, it is clear that the entrance-gates made a deep impression on his mind. Over and over again he comes back to the theme, speaking of their number, their substance, their beauty, and the names written upon them. He tells us, for example, that the city had twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels. Next he relates that the twelve gates were twelve pearls; every several gate was of one pearl. And once more, in this text, we learn that there were three on every side, looking away to the four quarters of the compass, on the east and the north and the south and the west.

It is all a picture, of course; a picture, not in colours, but in poetry; a picture of the great love of God the Father. God will have all men to be saved; and the twelve gates, facing each possible approach to the city, are an emblem of that. The doors of the Father's house look out to all the winds of heaven, and they are shut neither night nor day; for the love of God is open and the heart of God is waiting. Like the entrance to a great city hospital these gates are never closed.

1. Out of this mystical picture, therefore, we draw the preliminary truth that no point in the spiritual world exists from which men may not travel straight to God. When Christian people tell the story of their inner life, you discover that they set out from points very far asunder, and that the path each has taken lay through different scenes, with joys and griefs and perils of its own. Is it not all implicit in the prophet's confession long ago: 'All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way'? 'Every one to his own way'—then every one must find his own way back. No man wanders from God precisely as his neighbour does; no man's reclamation is precisely like his neighbour's.

Our sin may have been greater than our friend's, or less; but at least it was different; it was ours, as our birthday is ours, or our name, or our voice. Here is a man who ever since has given God thanks that grace came breaking in with power, and saved him from the leprosy of worldliness, so that his flesh came again like the flesh of a little child, and to-day he has a devout and tender heart in his bosom, and can pray. Here is another whom passion had nearly swept down; his feet were almost gone; but Christ, the mighty to save, held up his footsteps, and brought him into the calm shelter of God's purity, and made his standing there safe for perpetuity. No wanderer is so deep in sin's maze that he may not seize the gold thread of hope that will guide him back; no land is too far, no sea too wide, or mountain too high, for Christ's seeking love to reach and find us. No kind of sinner can be named who has not been led in, through one of the twelve gates, into God's holy city—not the covetous, not the lustful, not the proud, not even the insincere and false.

2. The gates on every side call up still another suggestion; they recall the variety of motives by which men are led to faith. Men come from every direction, but they also come for every kind of reason.

Men come from a sense of duty. For there is a large class of persons who, though totally unaffected by emotional appeals, are yet filled with a powerful desire to do right. These people before long are confronted with the personality of Jesus; His words stick in their conscience. Soon they feel that to refuse to submit their will to Christ's is to evade responsibility and evade obligation. So the pressure on conscience grows. The necessity arises of choosing between the higher life and the lower, of seizing the one real opportunity of life or making the great refusal. They know that if, while seeing the better, they finally and consciously follow the worse, they may never be able to look into the face of God again. When they meet with Christ in the Gospels, or with a Christ-like man in society (and they are not so uncommon), the inward voice declares: That is the kind of life you ought to live, and you know it. When they hear, as we all do, the Master's command ring out across the ages, 'Follow Me,' a great tide of responsive feeling surges up within, and they long to obey. So the conflict in the heart is waged; so the reasons for and against are balanced. Then some day the hour of decision strikes, and the simple duty is done of saying, 'Jesus is Lord.'

Others come from vague discontent with an empty life. They long for some purpose or ideal worth battling for; they covet an experience adequate to the enthusiasm they know they are ready to give. Often they are young; for it has been said, with truth, that 'young people soon find that life is not so large and rich and animating a thing as they hoped it would be.' At first they had dreams of what existence might prove, but these dreams have not come true. The hues of

sunrise have turned to grey. Life is losing its glow, its interest, its expectancy; and hope has long parted with its splendour and its charm. It is as if nothing now remained but to settle down in resignation to a career of failure; and at times they see, stretching out before them, the long, dusty road that goes down at last into the grave. Then Christ comes to them. He says, I am come that ye might have life, and might have it abundantly. He opens great prospects before their eyes, of hope and joy and possession, of inspiration and freedom that reach out and out infinitely. It is a new world, and they realize that it is all for them. So in simple gratitude and happy wonder they accept what Jesus offers. They take Him at His word, only to find that the black poisonous core of discontent and dulness has thereby been taken out of life, because they have been lifted out of themselves into the higher life of Christ, as He goes before them into the land their souls desire.

Still others come to God for shelter. What these people—a great unnumbered multitude—seek in God is refuge. We may say that this is a side of Christianity fit only for the old and the broken; but a man need not be very old to have buried his first-born, to have felt the touch of that ancient law of God which rends loved ones asunder, and makes havoc of our plans. How many lack the things that make life clear and bright for others! They need friends, and they have only acquaintances; they are oppressed by the awful solitude of life; they are misunderstood, or thought to have nothing in them; in this huge world they feel like children lost in a great city. Once perhaps they were free and light of heart, but grief has tamed their feelings. They have been out in the hailstorms of bereavement, they are beaten by losses, they are worn with struggle. So they long to be sheltered and solaced and rested. Is it weakness in them to feel like that? Ah! no; the strongest of men have confessed the same deep need; and to any careful reader of the biography of Thomas Carlyle it is plain that even his rugged nature was filled at times with an inexpressible craving for the consolation of a love that will never die.

Still further, others come from fear of moral ruin. They have learnt that they are no match for their own nature; they have discovered how little the anchors of prudence can be trusted when the storms of passion rise. After each collapse they make good resolves, and then these resolves go like matchwood in the next strain. Gradually they yield to temptations of an ignoble sort at which in happier days they would have smiled. At length they grow alarmed. How long is this to last, they say, and where will it end? It is not that they fear an offended God; and there may be very little sense of guilt. But there is an increasing sense of shame and self-disgust, as well as a sickening terror of the evil power that holds them in its grip. So their nerve is sapped, and they half lose each fight before it is begun. Each time the conflict is renewed they step into the field beaten men; and what they need is not the lash of a threat to whip them into battle, not doses of moral physic that will leave them weaker after every application, but a fountain of vital power within, that will renew the springs of action, and enable them to beat back these tigerish desires, and make them more than conquerors.

Finally, many come to God to be forgiven. All come to this ere long; all must so come; but also many set out from it. A writer has lately said that the feeling of guilt is dead to-day; if that be true, it will pass. There is a soul of honesty in men and women that may be trusted to keep alive the feeling of accountability, so long as there is a God in heaven, and failing, wandering mortals on the earth. In every still hour, when we face ourselves, we know that we need pardon; we are so made that to deny it is to deny our very self. Indeed, there is evil within us all which, if we could, we would fain hide from God Himself; though all the time a better instinct is whispering, surely, that He knows it already, and loves us still.

Chalmers in his great, deep, original way, said: 'What could I do if God did not justify the ungodly?' Yet this is what our Father does. There is a gate marked pardon, and over against it stands the Cross.

> Thy love, O Christ, arisen,
> Yearns to reach all souls in prison;
> Down beneath the shame and loss
> Sinks the plummet of the Cross,
> Never yet abyss was found
> Deeper than Thy love can sound.[1]

Tenth Sunday after Trinity.

The Phantasmagoria of Life.

'The parched ground shall become a pool.'—Is 35^{7}.

Apart from the treachery of the mirage which offers illusive waters to thirsty lips, there is also its confusion of the real and the unreal worlds. East of Damascus it may be seen for hours together, changing the grey vacancy of the horizon into an

[1] H. R. Mackintosh, *Life on God's Plan*, 29.

unceasing restless kaleidoscopic spectacle of swiftly changing form and colour. All sorts of familiar scenes suggest themselves to the imagination as picture succeeds picture. But the general effect is so powerful as to defy even the sanest mind to retain its sense of reality.

This aspect of the mirage suggests a nobler interpretation of the text than that of desire. We have, after all, a deeper quarrel with life than its false promises of satisfaction and happiness. We demand a stable and abiding sense of a real world in which we are dealing with realities. In the midst of many interests and pursuits there come moments when the whole sense of life fails us and seems to evaporate.

The great idealists have sought to safeguard man's belief in the reality of his spiritual experience by the most daring philosophies; asserting, in face of all such faintings of the spirit, that the ideas dwell in heaven, and that thought is the only reality. Christian optimists, like Kingsley and George MacDonald, have dogmatized on the courageous principle that such convictions are so beautiful that they must be true. We are grateful for all such voices, yet times of doubt recur. Are we indeed children of eternity, lying on our backs in the cave, as Plato says, and seeing but the reflection of things on the roof, yet knowing that the realities are sure? or are we but ants tumbling on the huge ant-heap, taking ourselves with an absurd seriousness, and dreaming great things? Do our sins and virtues, our struggles and resistances, our joys and sorrows really matter? or are these all but the cloud-work of the desert? The voice of God assures us that the mirage shall become a pool, real enough to live for or to die for. That is what Jesus Christ has done for the world.

1. Our *work* often induces a sense of unreality. Weary toilers, whether successful or unsuccessful, feel the vanity even of finished works, and still more the vanity of unfinished works. Many a man has built his tower, done what he set out to do, and the tower falls and his labour is lost; or, worse still, his tower stands only to shame him with its imperfection, for it is not the thing he had designed. Well, finished or unfinished, satisfactory or unsatisfactory, here is God's verdict upon man's honest labour. He approves the purpose of a life, and His approval establishes the work of our hands upon us. He understands what we meant to do and knows the pattern, showed us in secret, after which we have been striving. That, in God's sight, is reality. It is work, and has eternal value.

2. *Character* is often a most tantalizing and lamentable mirage. We see our goal, apparently possible and within our reach, and across the desert we pant after it. But which of us has attained to, or is anything resembling the man he fain would be? Old temptations recurring out of due season draw us down from high hopes to low levels of actual conduct. Honesty, justice, purity, even when we have reached them in some degree, are a compromise rather than a victory. At times a subtle doubt invades, and we find ourselves persisting, without knowing why we do so, in a moral struggle of whose worth we are by no means certain.

Again, God's word is that that mirage also shall become a pool. One day we shall be sure with an indisputable certainty of the worth of the struggle and of the glory of moral victory. He will 'take the distorted thing in His hands and make something gallant of it.'

3. *Faith*, once taken to be the surest of realities, is now discredited in many minds. The great mirage of Christianity itself is over. Jesus Christ remains but as the memory of a dream, a fair form in art, a hope from which the light has faded, a star vanished in the night.

This mirage also shall become a pool of living waters. In some form or other, Christian faith is going to prove true. Where the waters that once promised refreshment have vanished, and where now there are only deserts of intellectual routine, streams of vital truth will flow once more, never again to fail. Looking back when the change is completed, you will not count it a change from reality to unreality, but from an imperfect vision to the very truth of God and of life.

4. Each of these is but a detail in the great mirage of *life* itself. The world, with the brilliance of its spectacle and the heave and fall of its surge—we have found it out to be but cloud, and still we gaze. And heaven, as we once imagined it, that last and most delicate mirage of all—now we turn from its gaudy and inadequate cloudland. We have found out the earth and the heavens.

Yes, but beneath such shows of things there are realities—the new earth and the new heaven—an earth where life is real, a heaven where the real life of earth is made eternal. For Jesus Christ is Lord of Realities, and He is Master of earth and heaven, who 'maketh all things new.' He knows how we all dream, and how futile the dream appears on our awakening. But through it all there remain for all of us the facts of faith and love and service. These things are no dream, though on them also for a moment we may lose our hold. Yet for the faithful these will prove so real that

they will give reality to all the rest that tends so readily to fade. And at last comes death. 'After the fever of life, after wearinesses and sicknesses, fightings and despondings, languor and fretfulness, struggling and succeeding; after all the changes and chances of this troubled unhealthy state, at last comes death, at length the great white throne, at length the beatific vision.'[1]

Eleventh Sunday after Trinity.

Vital Fruitfulness.

'By their fruits ye shall know them.'—Mt 7^{20}.

1. Fruitfulness, we feel, is the one unerring criterion of the quality of life. The only question which in the last resort it is worth our while to ask about any life that has been lived is—What has been its effect? How has it told? What is the measure and what the kind of its influence?

And yet we feel that we are none of us equal to such a judgment, and that even if we were there is something cold and impersonal in its character which prevents our being satisfied with it. A human life is to us something more than a result even if we could measure that result justly and adequately. To us who have known it, it is something more than all its effects. If we would see how unsatisfactory this way of measuring human values must prove in our hands, we have only to consider how in fact we have attempted to apply it, what in fact have been the results of that attempt. And we shall find that we have applied it only to the great figures of history, and that in applying it we have for the most part robbed even those figures of all that was most distinctive and individual in their humanity. The hearts that have beat close to our own we could never bring ourselves to weigh in such abstract balances. And when at last a sufficient spiritual distance enables men to adjust the scales to this work of judgment, how uncertain and unsatisfying is the result. We ascribe to the great ones of the past, and perhaps with some degree of historical justice, results both for good and for evil which they themselves neither purposed nor foresaw. We say with some degree of justice, for men always effect something more and greater than they intend. Human greatness, indeed, consists especially in this, that its effects reach far beyond the measure of its conscious purpose. To see those effects is in a very real sense to compass more adequately the worth of the life out of which they have grown. Yet it is doubtful whether we have any right to say that it is to know the life more fully. The Franciscan movement of the thirteenth century in all its strength and weakness, its success and failure, its promise and its disappointment, was the measure of the fruitfulness of St. Francis' life. But the real secret of that life was communicated only to the few faithful friends of his working years. Nay, the depths of that secret lay hidden in the soul of St. Francis, transparent as was the purity of that soul beyond most of the souls of men. The fruitfulness of any life is put to the proof in other and lesser lives. No soul can be fruitful save on the terms of enduring that deformation and lessening of itself. What the rest of us can make of it, that it is worth or will seem to be worth to the world. Yet it itself remains more than that realized fruitfulness. It itself remains what it was worth to God in its unrealized effort, or it may be in that supreme attainment which it could never wholly communicate to another.

2. Our Lord may not have been speaking or thinking, primarily at least, of that ultimate fruitfulness which is one undoubted test of a soul's worth when He said, 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' He may have been thinking of something much simpler and more fundamental to the individual life, not of a far-off result, but of a result immediate and obvious. He may have been thinking merely of the profound difference between what the humanity in us is capable of becoming and what in fact it is usually satisfied with being. In this difference, He would remind us, lies the whole secret of religion. We would make a system of religion, a system of beliefs, of ordered devotion, of obedience to a formal rule. And all this, no doubt, religion always tends to become. Nay, all this religion, because it is human, must always be. But all this it is because it is the expression of a particular kind of life, and all this it can afford to be only so long as through it that kind of life is finding freer and fuller expression. And our Lord would remind us that the religious system must always stand at the bar of life and plead there for the judgment which alone will keep it sane and pure.

Let us think of what life means for most of us, what it means for all of us when we let ourselves slip, when we fail to hold up our hearts to the level of its greater hopes and aims. It means first of all and at its best a compromise. We compromise the great opportunity on the level of our customary careless, sluggish, cowardly moods. We trim our duties, our affections, our glimpses of a higher

[1] J. Kelman, *Ephemera Eternitatis*, 125.

truth, to the fashion of the place and of the day. And how wretched and poverty-stricken is the show of life they make! The blight of a narrow-hearted selfishness is on them all. They yield no permanent satisfaction to ourselves. They flower with no joy or fragrance or delight for others. We labour just to keep ourselves alive, to keep ourselves content with life, and if we succeed in the one we fail in the other. Or perhaps, fate more miserable still, we succeed in both. For life may cease to become a compromise and may come instead to be a surrender and a betrayal.

It is to this death in life that we may so easily descend, to this betrayal of the life to which as our inspiring heritage we were called. For think of what God meant our life to be, of what He has made it in each of us by infallible proofs graven on every heart. He has made it a life which can never be satisfied to remain what it is, which must look for its satisfaction to its own constant renewal, which must hunger and thirst after right and truth and charity if it would achieve them, and in achieving finds its own peace. He has made it a life which must feel its roots in Him, the eternal source and groundwork of all goodness and spiritual beauty; which must labour incessantly towards Him, the eternal consummation of justice and charity. To live at all is to find the energy of the Divine nature in all the best we can aim at being and doing, to find the Divine opportunities in the world of actual duty, to disentangle and receive the Divine inspirations in the world of actual influence, to resist, in the Divine might which ever prevents and follows us, the insidious wiles of our lazy contentment with what we are and with what through us the world happens at the moment to be. This is the new life, the life in God, the life which each of us may live or seek to live, the life whose fruits will be visible to all, however little they may be able to appraise them, and will serve to feed a hungry world with the bread of life. And that life needs not to withdraw itself from the world in order to be or to continue. It needs not to build itself some rare and exquisite pleasaunce of the soul. It must take all the risks of life. It must fight its fight in the open. It must shrink from no smirching that may come to it in God's arena, which is the common world where God's common human souls still throng and hustle each other in blind confusion. There will its fruits be known. There will it learn how to evoke God's order out of our human confusion, God's strength out of our human weakness.[1]

[1] A. L. Lilley, *The Religion of Life*, 19.

Twelfth Sunday after Trinity.

Breathing Spaces.

'And he said unto them, Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest a while.'—Mk 6^{31}.

This must have been a very welcome invitation to the disciples. They were tired men; continuous teaching had taken a good deal out of them, and they needed rest and reinforcement. They were sorrowful men, too; for John the Baptist had just been cruelly murdered by Herod, and the whole company were feeling the sadness of the occasion and the strain of the troubled time. It was a season of political unrest also, for there was a popular ferment afoot against Herod as the instigator of the vile crime; and quiet spiritual work has not much opportunity and cannot make much progress when the political passions of the populace are aroused. It was therefore a most appropriate time for withdrawment and rest, and the disciples would hear Christ's kindly words with a sigh of relief.

We sometimes cherish a one-sided, incomplete notion of Christianity. We think of it as making continuous appeals to our sense of duty, constant claims upon our moral nature, seeking to rouse, stimulate, awaken, encourage; it is the clarion call to the highest service and endeavour. The gospel is certainly that, but it is not only that. Men cannot bear more than a certain amount of strain. If body or brain be taxed beyond its strength a breakdown is inevitable. The gospel is not always crying, Arise, shine; put on your strength. Like a wise mother it sometimes says, Lie down, poor child, and take your rest. We hear a great deal now about the 'strenuous life'; but we are not often offered a sensible recipe for it. The strenuous life with so many people means a fussy life, tremendous activity, bustling, feverish excitement—a programme with no intervals. No wonder the modern man is so often a bundle of quivering nerves. He tries to keep up the pace, and finds he is not equal to the strain. Christ is more considerate for workers than they are to themselves. He goes on the principle that prevention is better than cure. The gospel story is full of beautiful instances of Christ's care and consideration for men's physical needs. What an exquisite touch of tender sympathy is that where He has compassion on the multitudes, and says to the disciples, 'Give ye them to eat; bid them sit down upon the green grass; lest they faint by the way, for some of them have come from far.' Lest they faint by the way! He would prevent a breakdown; he would fore-

stall disaster. Is this the way to deepen the spiritual life? Certainly, for the spiritual life itself has a physical basis, and no man is necessarily made more spiritual by becoming an invalid. Body and mind are so closely related, and when one gets run down the other often collapses out of sheer sympathy. Let us live the strenuous life by all means, but let us live it sanely; and we cannot live it sanely unless we take our intervals of repose, our seasons of rest, our times of recuperation and refreshment.

All kinds of labour need occasional recreation and relaxation. The secret of true success is to know what you can do and what you cannot do, and to work well within your strength. Some work by the sweat of the brow, some by the sorer sweat of the brain, and some by the sweat of the heart, which is the sorest sweat of all. If men and women are over-driven in any department of life, we must, in the name of Christ, seek to ameliorate their lot, and to create such conditions as will enable them to realize the ideal of a sound mind in a sound body. In these days of mechanical labour we must see that men and women do not themselves become machines. We talk about the dignity of labour, and the pride and pleasure of the workman in his work; and indeed, if it were his own handiwork, with the directing force of personality behind it, there would be sense and reason in our maxims. The sheer monotony of such toil is deadening and wearying, and the mechanical nature of it renders intervals of self-realization of the utmost necessity and importance.

'Come ye apart.' There is a value in occasional withdrawment. We must have these breathing spaces if we want to strengthen our bodies, stimulate our minds, and prolong our usefulness. Let us emphasize that word 'apart.' What we want by way of relaxation and reinforcement is something completely apart from our ordinary work, something absolutely different, something that takes us right out of our groove and exercises another side of our nature. Some parts of our being never seem to come into play at all; they are all locked rooms whose doors are never opened and whose thresholds are never crossed. Yet they contain much that is interesting, beautiful, and valuable; and the outlook from their windows will disclose a richer and wider landscape. Have a hobby of some kind. The holiday time ought not to be a time of pure laziness; it will be all the brighter and better and more bracing for the introduction of some intellectual element. The open air offers endless opportunities for the observer. The flowers, the rocks, the birds, the seashore, the mountain side, the leafy wood, all have something to say to the alert mind and responsive heart. And many find a rare pleasure in watching the sky and the marvellous and ever-changing configurations of the clouds in the great wide spaces, the open expanse of heaven. It will be impossible for us to be little, mean, petty, censorious, if we can only get the sky into our souls.

Then, too, let us emphasize the words 'into a desert place.' By that is meant some place where the valuable and rare luxury of quietness can be had, some place where there is no fear of being interrupted or disturbed. It is a most happy experience to go now and then to a spot where you know nobody and nobody knows you, and where you are even beyond the reach of letters and newspapers, and telegrams—those bombshells of civilization. There is a ministry of solitude, if you can only find it. Solitude is not necessarily isolation. The silences and solitudes of Nature are grateful and healing to a tired or worried or sorrowful man; but there is a solitude of the crowd which is almost equally precious. There are few things more curiously stimulating to the imagination than to walk through a town you have never been in before, where every face is strange and the very dialect is different. It is a desert place to you—and yet how much there is to read there in the strange faces, the unknown houses, the unfamiliar streets. God has set fountains of singular freshness and inspiration in desert places. When we are half-paralysed by routine, deadened with the familiar and the commonplace, we may often regain our life and restock our brain with ideas through contact with the unfamiliar, the novel, the strange.

Then, observe that Christ does not say, 'Go ye,' but 'Come ye': He is not sending them away, He is going with them; the fellowship is not to be broken up. And what an unspeakable value there is in such unrestrained, frank, free fellowships, where one can speak one's real thought without fear of misunderstanding. There is a morality of holidays; and a large part of it consists in congenial companionship. Don't leave Christ behind; whatever we are apart from, we must not be apart from Him. The landscape will have a richer colour, the hobby a more radiant interest, the fellowship a higher tone, the conversation a sweeter accent, the laughter a more wholesome ring, if we are with Him; for Christ's presence in the heart elevates and sweetens all things.

And, then, notice the qualifying term, 'rest

a while.' It is not a giving up of the work to which the disciples are invited; it is a preparation for more toil. It is not an abandonment of our tasks, but a reinforcement of our strength for larger service. A life all holiday would be as monotonous and depleting as a life all work. Even the purest delight may pall; even the pleasantest confection may cloy and sicken; there is even a monotony of sunshine and cloudless blue. We need enough rest to give us a zest for returning labour. And be sure of it—we shall enjoy our rest the more if we have done something to earn it and deserve it. It is the lazy man who finds the time hang heavily upon his hands. The worker comes back to his work with something more than the tan upon his cheek and a fresh spring in his step; he returns with a mind braced with the air of pure and lofty thought, with a heart full of happy memories and sweet content, and with an earnest purpose to spend and be spent in the service of the Son of Man.[1]

[1] W. A. Mursell, *Sermons on Special Occasions*, 71.

The Doctrine of the Atonement.

A TENTATIVE RECONSTRUCTION.

By the Reverend P. J. Beveridge, B.D., B.Sc., Catterline.

The question of the Atonement has been the battlefield of theological thought for ages. The history of theology is scattered with explanations of it that have been discarded, because they have been considered in some direction either morally unsound or intellectually untenable. Nor can it be said that the theory is even now in a satisfactory condition.

For in explaining the expiatory suffering of Christ for us, it must be laid down that no theory of a wrathful father conciliated by the sufferings of a son in place of the culprit, no theory of vicarious punishment, no theory of vicarious (substituted) righteousness, no theory dispensing with the need for repentance and personal amendment, can possibly be received. Such ideas at various periods have been favourably regarded; some of them at times have met with large adherence, but with theologians now they no longer carry any considerable weight.

Accordingly, in writers of the present time we still meet with frequent attempts to avoid the difficulty. Moberly, for example, endeavours to explain it by comparison with the shame of a good mother over a child who has fallen into grievous sin. 'The shame,' he says, 'which is her own child's, is her own.'[1] She identifies the child with herself, and in that identification the sin is as it were her own, and her sorrow is penitence for it. In like manner the agony of the soul of Christ, who is regarded as having identified Himself with mankind, would provide the Atonement with a similar explanation. I do not raise the question how far such identification is more than figurative. But I think Moberly has hardly persuaded us that it would be rational to speak of the repentance, or even of the penitence, of a sinless Christ.

It is not necessary to give detailed consideration to the views of other quite recent writers, many of whom echo earlier ideas. Bishop Temple,[2] as the net result of his discussion, seems to find in the Atonement chiefly a revelation of the heinousness of sin. 'Free forgiveness is immoral if it is lightly given.' We naturally ask why it should be less immoral if given on account of another's suffering. But 'The cross, by showing what sin costs God, safeguards His righteousness while He forgives.' If we note that this must mean, safeguards the opinion men may hold of His righteousness, it will be seen that it is hardly an answer. But again, further, he adopts the view of Abelard, that it is such an unveiling of God's love and goodness towards us as must certainly awaken an answering love, and, in its revelation of the cost whereby God overcomes evil, draw all men to their Saviour. At the same time it presents an unsurpassable example of perfect righteousness in man. Now these effects may be producible, but do they morally justify the means? A soldier may display this love for his country by dying on the battlefield, and rouse his comrades accordingly; but however much he may thereby teach them to despise death, could he display his love for his country, could he reasonably go out into the fire-zone, if beyond heartening them he did not intend to produce some tangible military

[1] *Atonement and Personality*, p. 118.

[2] *Christus Veritas*, ch. xiv.

result? Indeed, the reality of his action as being an expression of patriotism and a source of inspiration depends upon its being an attempt at some effective service in the struggle. His teaching, His example, His resurrection, of themselves justify us in saying that He came into the world for us. Among theologians there is now universal agreement that these explanations of the Atonement are important effects of the death of Christ that cannot be overlooked as reasons why the death-sacrifice with its attendant horrors was profitable, but they do not themselves characterize it as an expiation. Dr. Gore [1] sets forth most convincingly the proof that an expiatory sacrifice cannot be expunged from Scripture. Christ died for us. Not merely can isolated texts be quoted, but the whole outlook involves it.[2] Yet the difficulty, as above outlined, does not disappear. The question still remains, How can His death be an effective offering for us? He came into the sinful world for man, accepting the natural and humanly inevitable result. But how expiatory? That is the point. All the explanations so far suggested seem to involve something that impugns the perfect righteousness and justice of God. It would be a considerable alleviation for those troubled with doubt in the matter if it be found not impossible to trace *any* line of explanation whatever which would at no point imply principles that could seem in any aspect intellectually or morally unacceptable.

Naturally it is with the utmost diffidence that I venture fresh suggestions in a matter going so deeply into the mysteries of Christianity. I do not attempt it in the hope of finding a solution. The generality can well be satisfied with, and can by no means dispense with, a simple belief that Christ died for man, a belief which has been such a power in the ages, but the philosophic inquirer will feel himself impelled to go further, and the considerations to follow may provide him a foothold. I have indeed some hope they will at least make it plain that we need not altogether despair of some rational advance yet being made whence light may be cast upon the difficulty without impugning the righteousness and perfection of the Almighty.

Let us make our start from the ordinary standpoint of Trinitarian belief. The love of the Father for the Son and of the Son for the Father must be perfect love. Perfect love implies perfect sympathy. Sympathy and suffering cannot indeed be quantitatively equated as pain, they are qualitatively different. Besides, God's foreknowledge of the glorious issue is a factor that must modify any human conception of sympathy. But the Father's sympathy was perfect. There is among men no such sympathy, nor indeed could be, for our knowledge of the suffering of others is limited, but God is omniscient.

God abhors sin. Sin, even the smallest sin, is to the All-holy loathsome, abominable. The zenith of God's holiness is to the nadir of evil as heaven to hell. There is therefore nothing that to a human being can be conceived so loathsome and abominable as sin is to God. Also, even from such a consideration as this alone, it becomes plain that we have not, and cannot have, any true conception of sin's wickedness. Hence, since we do not know sin—indeed, the more deeply we fall, the less capable we become of comprehending its wickedness—we cannot attain to true penitence for it. Our deepest penitence is utterly below what its heinousness in the sight of God requires. Nor does a change of life make any reparation for the past; doing duty in the future does not undo past evil. Such penitence, then, as we can offer is utterly inadequate, and reparation on our part is impossible. Forgiveness therefore cannot be claimed, it can come only of the free gift of God.

Man was created for union and perfected fellowship with God. That is the goal and crown of existence, and its imperfection is what underlies the unrest and dissatisfaction in life, so painfully set forth in Ecclesiastes.

Now let us note a fact of human feeling. If we have suffered, if we have undergone some painful struggle or labour, suppose it the highest endurance conceivable, incurred for the purpose, say, of saving the life of a fellow-man, and have succeeded, then our feelings toward such a one will be totally changed. Looking on him we might find him repulsive, let us say, from some loathsome disease, but in view of what we have already endured for his sake our interest in him will not be annulled by that. We are drawn to him by bonds of a greatly multiplied power. Not even our natural repulsion, great as it may be, will induce us to thrust him aside. Pain endured for another goes to overpower in its degree the natural abhorrence.

We now apply this to the Atonement. God abhors sin. He has therefore beyond our human expression or conception a repulsion towards the sin-stained. That is the character of God. It is ingrained in His perfect holiness, a part of His eternal and unchangeable nature. No repentance can truly cleanse the sin-stained, no amendment

[1] *Belief in Christ*, ch. x.

[2] Of course this may be denied. See Rashdall, *Idea of Atonement*, p. 31 ff.

can undo the past. Repentance and amendment can only incline God towards forgiveness. Perfect forgiveness involves a perfect return to unity in God, a perfect restoration of the Divine fellowship which is the goal of being. But how shall the All-holy touch the unclean? God meeting imperfect repentance *can* do so of course; He *can* declare, 'The Lord also hath put away thy sin,' but this contact, this renewed unity, results only from a violent strain in the repulsion which is of the eternal nature of God. But the Son has suffered, the Father has suffered in sympathy, and if we may, as we do in other matters, interpret God's character from our own, that sacrifice will make it, we may not say possible, for it never was impossible, but—to use in all reverence the language of feeble human thought—make it more easy for God the Father to overcome that repulsion, that awful strain on the Divine nature, and to receive, for the sake of all this suffering endured, into His bosom once more the repentant. And thus this great offering and sacrifice is, as every sacrifice is meant to be, a gift for the advantage of the receiver, a true offering, a freewill offering from the Son to the Eternal Father. And through that sacrifice therefore the pardon of the penitent is sealed.

The principle of this suggestion totally avoids all the difficulties that have cropped up under other modes of viewing the Atonement. It still sets forth Christ as sacrificed for us, for our sins, without in any way involving vicarious punishment. It makes no hint of forgiveness where there is not an effort at repentance and amendment. It gives to the act of Christ an active and 'independent value prior to our response to it.'[1] It pierces the barrier of necessarily imperfect repentance, and opens a clear channel for an inflow of grace from God by reception once more into fellowship with Him, thus not only furthering repentance, but providing a real deliverance and pardon. It is still to the fullest extent a revelation not only of God's hatred of sin, but also of His surpassing love for His creatures, and makes with undiminished force the great appeal for their answering love. Lastly, the postulate underlying its explanation is a *vera causa* known to be active, however psychology explains it, in the spirit of man, and therefore justifiably assumed to be active in God.

A little consideration will make evident that among those embracing the views of the mediæval Abelard the onset made, for example, by Dr. Rashdall upon the Pauline doctrine of vicarious sacrifice, when met with the theory above outlined, loses entirely its point. As already remarked, I wish to emphasize that this theory is not here put forward as a final explanation, but rather as providing assurance that a reasonable and entirely moral solution of the Atonement difficulty is at least not impossible.

The lines upon which the explanation proceeds involve from first to last no principle in the slightest degree unreasonable, no principle showing in the slightest degree any tendency towards defective morality. Nevertheless many will receive it with hesitation. If so, then so far as my decernment goes, ground for hesitation can be found only at two points. Firstly, there is the fact that we can form no measure of the strain of the repulsion in the nature of the All-holy God against 'embrace' or 'contact' with one yet stained with imperfectly repented sin. Secondly, we can form no measure of what degree of offset and neutralization to that repulsion He may in accordance with this theory discover in the recollection of all that by the sufferings of Christ has been endured for the returning sinner. To estimate these two factors in the explanation is evidently beyond our power. Yet it must be upon the complete estimate of these two factors that the acceptance of the explanation as entirely satisfactory would depend. Nevertheless, as before remarked, it yields a full assurance that a reasonable and morally unexceptionable explanation of the Atonement, whether we find means to reach it or not, is at least no impossibility. And with such assurance we may well be content.

[1] As desiderated by Mozley, *Doctrine of the Atonement*, p. 212.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

In the second volume of his *Konfessionskunde*,[1] Professor Mulert, while not neglecting the Anglican Church, and while devoting at least a brief discussion to Presbyterians, Baptists, Congregationalists, Quakers, Methodists, the Salvation Army, etc., has wisely chosen to concentrate on the nature, constitution, beliefs, and practices of the Roman Catholic Church, as, next to their own, that is the Church

[1] Hermann Mulert, *Konfessionskunde* (Töpelmann, Giessen; geh. Mk.12, geb. Mk.14).

which it is most important for German Protestants, in the present religious condition of Germany, to understand. The situation in our own country at the present time is such that this book would be hardly less valuable here than in Germany, as by its accuracy and detail it is well fitted to dissipate haziness and misconceptions and to carry us into the inner secret and spirit of the Church of Rome. Mulert is careful to point out, however, that the Catholicism of each country has a character of its own; that of Italy is not quite the same as that of France, Ireland, Spain, or Poland. The present power of the Pope, significance of dogma, the sacraments, prayer, the Church's attitude to the saints, to science and art and modern culture, Catholic morality and piety—these and other cognate subjects are treated with a fullness and lucidity which will enable Protestant students to have a really intelligent grasp of one of the most potent religious forces of the present day.

The first volume of a monumental work on *Ancient Arabia* [1] has just been issued by Dr. Nielsen of Copenhagen, in association with Hommel of Munich and Rhodokanakis of Graz, assisted by other scholars. This volume, which is furnished with seventy-six fine illustrations, deals with the Culture of Ancient Arabia, and it will be followed by other two, which will present the text and translation, with a commentary, of the most important inscriptions, and also a vocabulary and grammar. Nielsen himself, besides sketching the available material, discusses the religion of Ancient Arabia; Hommel deals with the history of Southern Arabia; Rhodokanakis with public life in the south Arabian States; and Grohmann with the archæology. The material worked over in this massive volume is so skilfully handled that the reader forgets its extreme difficulty as he moves easily over these fluent and extraordinarily interesting pages. Perhaps the most generally interesting chapter is that of Nielsen on the religion of Ancient Arabia, which is discussed in its relation to Israel and Islam. The volume is a very substantial contribution to our knowledge of Semitic religion and culture, and in it the dead past becomes very much alive.

A veritable mine of information on questions connected with the ethnology of religion is presented in the volume [2] which records the proceedings of the International Congress held at Milan on 17th to 25th September 1925. The more popular addresses delivered in the evening before large public audiences are not reproduced, but most of the technical papers are here given, each in the language in which it was presented—Italian, French, or German. There are contributions from explorers and missionaries as well as from Professors in the Universities of many lands, and naturally the data which form the basis of the discussions are drawn from the religions of primitive as well as cultured peoples. Much attention is given to 'auxiliary sciences,' notably psychology. The moral sense is discussed in a series of eight papers, which includes one by Professor Wunderle on the ethical foundations of primitive culture. Perhaps the most generally interesting part of the volume is the series of ten papers dealing with the Idea of Redemption. Schumacher deals with some of the primitive tribes of Central Africa; Ballini with the idea of redemption in primitive Buddhism; Battifol with the same idea in the New Testament; Ruch with the Eucharist and the pagan mysteries; Allo with the saviour-gods of Græco-Roman paganism; Junker with the Osiris religion and Egyptian ideas of redemption; Pestalozza with the idea of salvation in Mazdeism; and Galbiati with Christian ideas in the Koran. The work of these learned Roman Catholic scholars was designed to serve the interests alike of Science and of Faith; and though it forms an indirect apologetic for the Faith as held by the Catholic Church, we can well believe, as one of the speakers at the opening session claimed, that the study of the various religions was conducted 'avec la critique la plus scrupuleuse.'

In a rectorial address [3] delivered at Bonn on November 7, 1926, Professor Meinhold discussed the Decalogue. The sources which come up for consideration in the course of the discussion are J^1 (about 850 B.C.), J^2 (about 750), E (about 650), Deuteronomy, and the prophets. Meinhold has little patience with those who claim a Mosaic origin for the Decalogue. He reaches the conclusion, which is practically the same as Steuernagel's, that it originated either during the Exile or in the period immediately following. He thinks the emphasis on the Sabbath points in that direction, and that the prophets show no familiarity with it, Isaiah ($1^{10ff.}$) and Hosea ($2^{13ff.}$) even rejecting the Sabbath. The argument, though skilfully conducted, will not

[1] *Handbuch der altarabischen Altertumskunde*, herausgegeben von Dr. Ditlef Nielsen (Leipzig: Otto Harrasowitz).

[2] *Settimana Internazionale di Etnologia Religiosa* (Geuthner, Librairie Orientaliste, Paris, 13 Rue Jacob, VI^e; 35 frs.).

[3] *Der Dekalog*, von Hans Meinhold (Töpelmann, Giessen; Mk.1.30).

convince those—and they are a growing number—who believe that the Mosaic origin of the Decalogue is thoroughly defensible on the basis of a strictly historical and literary criticism of the Old Testament. This will not be the last word on that much debated question.

Professor König has given another proof of his almost incredible industry by producing an elaborate commentary of five hundred and sixty-seven large pages on the prophet Isaiah.[1] Like all König's work on the Old Testament, it is marked by what his opponents would call a conservative bias, though this description is not strictly applicable to a work which is sustained from beginning to end by so thoroughly scientific a spirit. He sets his face like a flint against needlessly late dates and needless emendations, and, where so much radical criticism holds the field, it is good to be reminded by a great scholar how subjective much of it is, and that there is still something to be said for views which show more respect for tradition. The clever suggestion of de Lagarde, for example, for the difficult verse 10^{4a} which makes it mean, 'Beltis is crouching, Osiris is shattered,' is rejected, and the existing text is explained and defended, with the single change of ברע to יכרע, the initial י having been lost by haplography through the previous word בלחי ending in the same letter. König does not believe in prefatory remarks which tend to bias interpretation; he always begins by letting the text speak for itself, and in the comments which follow he does scrupulous justice to those who differ from, as well as to those who agree with, him. Of particular value are his grammatical, syntactical, and philological discussions: on these points he has more than most men earned the right to be heard.

As an example of his respect for the traditional text may be mentioned his retention of the word עַמִּי in 53^{8b} on which so much depends ('for the transgression of *my people*'), rejecting alike עַמִּים and מִפְּשָׁעִים; while for the much disputed בְּמֹתָיו in 53^{8} he reads simply בָּמֹתָיו, defending the meaning of בָּמָה as 'grave-mound' by an appeal to Ezk 43^{7b} and the plural by an appeal to his Grammar. There is, as is fitting, an elaborate discussion of the Jahweh in the Servant songs, whom he identifies with Israel, taking the term sometimes in a wider, sometimes in a narrower sense—a liberty which will not commend itself to everybody. As an illustration of the thoroughness with which all the relevant literature, even the most recent and foreign, has been exploited may be mentioned the fact that notice has been taken of an article contributed not long ago to The Expository Times by Mr. John Monteith, who argued that 52^{13}–53^{12} was compiled from two songs, one whose theme was a leper, the other the captive nation.

[1] Eduard König, *Das Buch Jesaja* (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; geb. Mk.26).

It would be impossible, in a necessarily brief notice, to do the remotest justice to the volume of essays[2] contributed, in accordance with the genial German custom, in honour of Professor Jülicher on his seventieth birthday by pupils and friends who have been influenced by his spoken or written words on the New Testament. A bare summary will indicate the wide variety of the contents. Sattler writes on the Anawim in the time of Jesus; Bauer on Jesus the Galilean; Meyer on the Origin of the Gospel of Mark; Curtis on the Parable of the Labourers (Mt 20^{1-16}); Rade on The Neighbour; Wetter of Upsala on the Damascus Vision and the Gospel of Paul; Mundle on the Problem of the Intermediate State in *2* Co 5^{1-10}; Windisch on the five Johannine words about the Paraclete; Bultmann gives an analysis of the First Epistle of John; Holl discusses a fragment of a hitherto unknown letter of Epiphanius; Müller deals with Canons 2 and 6 of Constantinople (381 and 382); Schwartz with the Empress Pulcheria at the Synod of Chalcedon; Lietzmann with a liturgical papyrus of the Berlin Museum; and von Soden with the Latin text of Paul in Marcion and Tertullian. Every one of these essays either adds to our knowledge or suggests fresh points of view. Rade, for example, argues that neighbour is not just the man who needs our help, but is man, every other man; and Wetter maintains that when Paul says, 'it pleased God to reveal His Son in me,' the reference of this revelation is not to be confined to the Damascus vision and call: that revelation was only the first of many. A welcome volume to every student of the New Testament and the Early Church.

John E. McFadyen.

Glasgow.

[2] *Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher* (Mohr, Tübingen; geh. Mk.18, geb. Mk.21).

A Neglected Prophet.[3]

Soren Kierkegaard died in 1855, aged forty-two, a lonely, heroic, and sympathetic man, who had

[3] T. Bohlin, *Kierkegaard's dogmatische Anschauung in*

poured forth his soul for thirteen years in thirty volumes, and an equal bulk of unpublished MSS. His incessant effort is to make clear to his generation what genuine personal Christianity is, insisting that it is fellowship in Christ's sufferings, and a life of practical obedience and imitation, a feature little seen in the nominal Christianity around him. Yet, naturally, he could not conduct this long polemic, which cost him love, friends, money, and health, without at the same time developing his own theological views. Of these the present volume is a very full and leisurely and readable account, given with constant reference to the modern movements that he anticipated rather than largely influenced. It is remarkable to find that the positions of the Barthian dialectic were taken up in similar fashion seventy years ago. In Kierkegaard there is the same insistence on the critical importance of the Cross and the Resurrection going along with the same depreciation of history; the same insistence on the paradox of faith and the invalidity of sinful and finite human reason, coupled with the same passionate demand for the acceptance of the results of dialectic. It is not to be wondered at that the Swiss school discovers in Kierkegaard a prophet indeed, and that one of them has written: 'To-day the great Dane is celebrating his triumph in Germany.'

This translation is another proof of the profound impulse recently given there to theology. What one misses, and what would hardly have been omitted by an English writer operating on this scale, is a short account and estimate of Kierkegaard's own intense and tragic life of toil and suffering, of inward and outward conflict. This, and a more energetic attempt to grasp and compress the results, would have enlivened a very valuable book.

R. W. STEWART.

Cambuslang.

ihrem geschichtlichen Zusammenhang, tr. from the Swedish into German by Ilse Meyer (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh, 1927, pp. 592; M.17).

Jeremiah and 'The Suffering Servant of Jehovah' in Deutero-Isaiah.

BY THE REVEREND F. A. FARLEY, CHATHAM.

I.

THE characteristics of the 'Servant of Yahwe' in Is 40–55 are so diverse as to make the identification of the Servant a very difficult problem.

1. The opinion that the 'Servant' is an individual is held in two forms:

(i) That he is an historical individual such as Jeremiah, Ezekiel, or a nameless martyr of the time of Manasseh or of the Exile.

(ii) That he is a personage destined to arise in the future as the agent of God's salvation to Israel, and through Israel to the world. This is virtually a revision of the Messianic hope, a prophet and martyr taking the place of a king and conqueror.

2. The 'Servant' has been held to be a personification of the ideal Israel, or of the spiritual Israel, the 'Remnant' or religious kernel of the people.

Whether an 'individual' or a 'collective' interpretation be adopted, difficulties remain. Professor A. B. Davidson considers that it is impossible to regard the Servant as an individual, and gives as his reasons:

(i) Some of the passages actually identify the Servant with Israel.

(ii) Though some of the descriptions are distinctly 'individual,' a 'collective' personified would be spoken of as a person.

(iii) The Servant in Is 53 is represented as rising from the dead. This might apply to the Restoration from the Exile, but, as used of an individual, is far in advance of what we expect from Old Testament ideas of immortality.

(iv) The point of view of Deutero-Isaiah being the Exile, and the final felicity of the people being connected with the imminent fall of Babylon and the consequent Restoration of the Jews to Palestine,

there is no time for an individual to arise and pass through the experiences foretold of him.

Professor Skinner also concludes that a revised Messianic hope is precluded by the fact that where the individual features are most pronounced, the retrospective character of the description is most apparent.

The real difficulty, then, is to find an identification which will do no violence either to the features of the portrait which are distinctly individual, or to the passages in which the Servant evidently stands for a community. We must also take note of the apparent differences between the 'Servant' of the Poems (Is 42^{1-4} 49^{1-6} 50^{4-9} 52^{13}–53^{12}), who is idealized, personal, and sinless, and the 'Servant' of the rest of Deutero-Isaiah, who is blind and deaf, but yet has a great destiny to fulfil.

II.

The solution to be proposed arises from a study of the Book of Jeremiah and the appearance of direct references in Deutero-Isaiah, especially in 'Servant Poems,' to the experience of the prophet Jeremiah. The data will therefore be examined first, and the conclusions drawn when the examination is complete.

The first poem, Is 42^{1-4}, especially in vv.[1-4], recalls the terms of Jeremiah's call and his reluctance to accept it. See Jer 1^{5-8}.

Is 42^{6} recalls the promise of Jer 1^{8}, and the idea that the 'Servant' is to be 'a covenant of the people' may well arise from Jeremiah's attitude to the Deuteronomic Code and his desire for a 'covenant written on the heart.' Since he was so active in seeking to promote this covenant of the spirit he might well be thought of as 'a covenant of the people,' just as Elisha's vigilance on Israel's behalf led to his being regarded as 'the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof.' In Is 49^{8} the Servant is again regarded as the equivalent of 'a covenant of the people.'

The second poem, Is 49^{1-6}, seems to be directly connected with the call and experience of Jeremiah. Is 49^{1} recalls Jer 1^{5}; and Is 49^{4} is just the kind of language Jeremiah employed in those passages which have been called his 'Confessions.' He might well have said, 'I have laboured in vain, I have spent my strength for nought and vanity.' In Is 49^{6} we see an enlarged mission and unexpected success foretold as the reward of the Servant's fidelity through discouraging times, but the wider field here promised to the Servant is not beyond the scope of Jeremiah's own ordination (see Jer $1^{5.10}$).

The third poem, Is 50^{4-9}, might, without any modification of language, have been written of Jeremiah himself. With Is 50^{4} compare Jer 1^{9}; and with Is 50^{6-9} compare Jer $17^{17f.}$ 20^{7-12} 26^{14}.

The great poem in Is 52^{13}–53^{12} is very rich in passages which seem to owe their language as well as thought to reflection upon the experiences of Jeremiah. As this is a crucial passage in the choice between a personal and a collective identification of the 'Servant,' we will examine it in fuller detail.

In Is 52^{15}, 'Kings shall shut their mouths because of him,' may we not see a reference to the respect paid to Jeremiah by the court, and especially by King Zedekiah?

Phrase by phrase we may see Jeremiah in Is 53^{1-9}.

V.[1]. A suitable comment on the reception accorded to Jeremiah and his message, few among his contemporaries having perceived the Divine power behind the prophet.

V.[2] offers an explanation of the poor reception awarded to the 'Servant.' 'A tender plant' may refer to Jeremiah's shrinking from his task (see Jer 1^{6}), but more probably the whole phrase כְּיוֹנֵק וְכַשֹּׁרֶשׁ מֵאֶרֶץ צִיָּה has reference to the apparently effete family of the descendants of the deposed priest Abiathar. Jeremiah's origin and possibly his personal presence were heavy handicaps against his success as a prophet.

V.[3]. A large selection of extracts from the Book of Jeremiah might be offered as suggesting the language of this verse. It accurately describes the prophet's experience. Compare Jer 20^{14-18}.

Vv.[4, 5]. The chief burden borne upon the heart of Jeremiah was not the treatment he suffered, nor the uncertainty of his own fate, but the painful certainty of his people's fate. Do not Jer 15^{11} and 17^{16} speak of his praying for his people? And are not his 'perpetual grief' and his 'mortal wound' (Jer 15^{18}) the pains he feels for them? All through the siege, while he was advising surrender and even desertion to the Babylonians as the only way of safety, Jeremiah himself remained loyally to suffer with those who spurned his advice; and after the siege, when the choice is offered him, either to go into honourable exile in Babylon or to

remain with the Jews in Palestine, he chooses to remain. If Judah had had no griefs or sorrows or sins, Jeremiah would have had none of the wounds and bruises of which he complains.

Moreover, in view of his opposition to the policy of resistance to Babylon, which would be accounted both unpatriotic and a betrayal of the nation's faith in Yahwe and in the inviolability of Zion, his sufferings and imprisonment would be regarded by his contemporaries as fully deserved. They would say he was 'smitten of God.'

The significance of the remaining sentences of these verses, 'the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed,' may become clear when we state our conclusions.

V.[6] is a confession, put into the mouth of the Jewish people, of their waywardness, and a testimony to the keenness with which the 'Servant' felt that waywardness and suffered for it. This, also, was true of Jeremiah. It represents the verdict of posterity reversing the judgment of Jeremiah's own generation.

Vv.[7, 8] bear very close resemblances to Jer 11[19]. Jeremiah says, וַאֲנִי כְּכֶבֶשׂ אַלּוּף יובל לִטְבוּחַ ('And I as a gentle lamb was brought to the slaughter'); Is 53[7] has כְּשֶׂה לַטֶּבַח יוּבָל וּכְרָחֵל לִפְנֵי גֹזְזֶיהָ נֶאֱלָמָה וְלֹא יִפְתַּח פִּיו ('As a sheep to the slaughter is brought, and as a (ewe) sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth'). Again Jeremiah says, וְנִכְרְתֵנּוּ מֵאֶרֶץ חַיִּים וּשְׁמוֹ לֹא־יִזָּכֵר עוֹד ('And let us cut him off from the land of the living, that his name may be remembered no more'); and Is 53[8] has וְאֶת־דּוֹרוֹ מִי יְשׂוֹחֵחַ כִּי נִגְזַר מֵאֶרֶץ חַיִּים (=And his generation who considered, that (or, for) he was cut off from the land of the living).

V.[9] has always presented a difficulty. It is 'difficult,' says Professor Skinner, 'to justify this sense of rich' as synonymous with 'wicked' from O.T. usage, and several emendations have been proposed.

Here we may find help when we remember that Jeremiah was forcibly carried off by the fugitive rulers of Judah to Egypt, when his choice would have been to remain with his people in their own land. In Egypt Jeremiah died.

From this point onwards we miss the close parallel with events in the life of Jeremiah, and have to face the difficulty that the 'Servant' is spoken of as seeing, in a resurrection life, the fruit of his toil and suffering, and as continuing his mission with still greater success. As applied to an individual this is far in advance of any O.T. belief concerning the persistence of life beyond death. We must therefore state our conclusion with due regard to this development at the end of the poem in Is 53.

III.

We have heard in recent years of the need for a Martyr-Nation in the cause of Peace, and have used the phrase 'the Crucifixion of a people.' The idea is, of course, suggested by our Lord's fulfilment of His Mission in His Passion and His Death. Had we met with defeat in the Great War, those who held to the conviction that we engaged in it righteously would have comforted us with the reflection that we were the Martyr-Nation, following our Lord in suffering for righteousness' sake.

These examples show how easily the fate and experience of an individual may furnish language to describe the destiny of a people.

May not the author of the Servant-Poems have begun with a similar thought? The people of Israel was to be the world's Jeremiah, but the destiny of Israel would be fulfilled, not by the imperfect nation as a whole, but by the prophetic element in Israel, which is regarded as the real 'genius' of the people.

On the one hand, we must remember the frequent use of the word עֶבֶד for the 'prophet'; and on the other hand, it is reasonable to suppose that the thoughts of the Exiles would be much occupied with Jeremiah, the prophet who foretold, strove to avert, but lived to see, the captivity under which they suffered. Jeremiah would naturally be thought of as 'The Servant of the Lord'; he would even furnish features for the picture of the ideal 'Servant' or 'prophet.'

The Poems, then, are songs of 'Idealized Prophecy.' The soul of the Jews lived and found expression in its Prophets, and the poet expects the destiny and function of the Jews to be fulfilled by prophecy when resuscitated. Since the poet turned to Jeremiah as the historic figure most nearly approaching his ideal for prophecy, we shall expect just that combination of individual and collective features which have caused the difficulty in interpretation. Further, the vindication of the

martyred Servant, as described in the concluding verses of Is 53, ceases to present the difficulties which its combination with the intensely individual features of the earlier verses of that chapter has hitherto produced.

Let us summarize the arguments in favour of this theory.

1. It resolves the difficulty of the variation between the individual and the collective features of the figure.

2. It accounts for the fact that the Mission of the Servant is at times spoken of as to Israel (*i.e.* to Jacob) and at other times as to 'the nations'; for while this poet's special theme is the function of Hebrew prophecy in the world, there must still remain for it a function to perform in Israel.

3. It is possible to find in Is 40–55 an exilic vindication of the prophetic as against the priestly party in Israel. Not only is there the characteristic prophetic demand for spiritual renewal, but even atonement is regarded as worked out, not by the animal sacrifices in the Temple, but by the self-sacrifice of the prophets themselves. This Professor George Adam Smith suggests in his Baird Lecture on Jeremiah, p. 159, and Professor Skinner concludes his *Prophecy and Religion* with a passage on the same theme. Prophecy can only fulfil its function at a cost, as Jeremiah only achieved his mission at a cost. This is the theme of Is 53.

4. Reading through the 'Servant-Poems' as a whole, after this examination, the conviction grows that Prophecy is the Servant thus idealized and celebrated.

Let us consider the objections raised to this and similar interpretations. Gesenius and Staerk, among others, have suggested that the 'Servant' represents the order of prophets; and Bleek, Knobel, and Whitehouse have interpreted the Servant as 'the spiritual kernel' of Israel. The objections urged against these views are:

(1) That the order of prophets 'or the spiritual kernel' would never have been regarded as the special objects of Divine displeasure, as was the Servant (see Is 53^4).

(2) It could not be said that the spiritual Israel passed through death and resurrection, as is said of the Servant.

These objections do not really hold against the view that the poems are songs of Idealized Prophecy.

In regard to (1) there were times when the sufferings of the prophets, and especially of Jeremiah, led to the popular verdict that they were the objects of Divine wrath, and in answer to (2) we may surely say that in the author or authors of Deutero-Isaiah the prophetic spirit had revived. 'He shall see his seed, etc.' (Is 53^{10}), cannot be taken to apply to an individual like Jeremiah, but it can be said of prophecy in Israel.

If the view here given prove acceptable it gives a firm basis for recognizing its actual fulfilment in our Lord, '*the* Prophet.' Many of His sayings show that He interpreted His Mission as prophetic in spirit, and that 'the Servant of the Lord' of Deutero-Isaiah was never very far from His thoughts. He is the perfect realization of the ideal of Hebrew Prophecy.

Contributions and Comments.

Cross-Bearing.

I REALLY must apologize to Mr. Bryan for my delay. I did not see the May EXPOSITORY TIMES till very late. I still agree with all the commentators as against him.

(1) σταυρός in N.T. Greek is used almost exclusively for a cross (apart from the saying in question).

(2) All four Evangelists are careful to report that Jesus *carried* His own cross (or had it carried for Him), under the familiar rule (Plut., *de sera numinis vindicata*, c.g. Artem. 2. 56 are Grimm's references. I have no books), and they use indifferently αἴρειν (Mt, Mk), φέρειν (Lk), and βαστάζειν (Jn) for the carrying.

(3) Therefore we are justified in assuming that the early Christians, like Alexander and Rufus, reading Christ's epigram about a σταυρός, with the verbs λαμβάνειν (Mt 10^{38}), αἴρειν (Mt 16^{24}, Mk 8^{34}, Lk 9^{23}), used indifferently, would understand σταυρός to be a cross carried by the condemned.

Let me add that the epigram comes in such close connexion with Christ's own Cross in the incident of

Cæsarea Philippi and with the rebuke to Peter there (Mt 16, Mk 8, Lk 9) that to make it apply to moving a tent-pole is to wreck the passage.

I wonder what Mr. Bryan means by '*only* a readiness to die.' That seems to me in 2 Co 9 to be a bigger thing than moving tent-pegs.

His case seems to rest on a supposed parallel with the Hebrew נסע (compare *ἀνάγειν*, 'to weigh anchor'). The substantive governed by נסע is usually omitted, but in Is 33^{20} it is expressed, and what is 'drawn' is not the tent-pole at all, but the whole array of little tent-pegs, that could hardly be called collectively *τὸν σταυρόν*.

DONALD MATHESON.

Peaslake, Surrey.

ἀγαπάω and φιλέω: A Rejoinder.

MAY I be permitted a brief rejoinder to Mr. C. F. Hogg's criticism (in May) of one of my LXX notes in October last? Mr. Hogg regards the LXX change from *ἀγαπᾶν* to *φιλεῖν* in Gn $37^{3.4}$ as suggesting 'a nice distinction on the part of the translators,' and also he appears to regard the other change, from *παρα* with acc. to *ἐκ* with gen., similarly. I am by no means convinced. I hold that I was following a sounder canon of interpretation when I assumed that changes in the translation, where the original used both the same verb (*āhēv*) and the same preposition (*min*) in both clauses, should be regarded as ornamental rather than real, so making both *ἀγαπᾶν* and *φιλεῖν* and *παρα* with acc. and *ἐκ* with gen. to all intents and purposes respectively synonymous.

But even granting that translators, whether they should do so or not, do actually at times introduce finer shades of meaning, I rather wonder how Mr. Hogg—in the light of what he says about Jacob's love for Joseph—will deal with the translator's use of *ἀγαπᾶν* in Gn 25^{28}, where we read *ἠγάπησεν δὲ Ἰσαὰκ τὸν Ἡσαύ, ὅτι ἡ θήρα αὐτοῦ βρῶσις αὐτῷ*: '*Isaac loved Esau, because his* (Esau's) *hunting was meat unto him* (Isaac).' Can Mr. Hogg maintain that the choice of *ἀγαπᾶν* shows that Isaac's love for Esau was 'a discerning one based upon character'?

As regards Jn $21^{15\text{-}17}$ I commend Dr. Marcus Dods' notes in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*, and also the notes of B. L. Gildersleeve quoted and referred to in Moulton and Milligan's *Vocabulary* under *ἀγαπάω*.

H. HIGHFIELD.

Aberystwyth.

Isaiah vii. 8.

For the head of Syria is Damascus,
And the head of Damascus is Rezin:
And within threescore and five years shall Ephraim be
broken in pieces, that it be not a people:
And the head of Ephraim is Samaria,
And the head of Samaria is Remaliah's son.

IN giving a few instances of the errors which still deface the text of Isaiah, and of the method of their rectification, it seems best to select such as are as unlike as possible to each other in order to show the strange variety of the mistakes which have been made in transmission. Something has already been done to remedy this hitherto incomprehensible passage, namely, the removal of what is obviously an editorial note interrupting the rhythm, of what is a single highly epigrammatic quatrain—a very unfortunate note, since, as Dr. Peake points out, Isaiah was promising an immediate relief to Judah, while the gloss defers this relief to a later generation.

But this suggestion does not remove the real difficulty; indeed, it is not the gloss which creates the difficulty, but the difficulty which accounts for the gloss. The four lines give no intelligible message, and for this reason some ancient scribe considered that he must insert something more definite. This is an unhappy feature of the Isaianic text, that from its very importance it has suffered from the well-meant but disastrous attempts of these early commentators to restore textual corruptions. This does not in the least imply any want of reverence on the part of these scholars, but rather the reverse, that they were so convinced of the value of the text that they emended not wisely but too well. Here, fortunately, they have done little harm, for they have not tampered with the actual text, but supplied what was probably a marginal note, which was afterwards incorporated in the actual prophecy. This note is good evidence that they could make no sense of the text. Their successors have fared very little better, for, to take Dr. Peake as giving the verdict of modern scholarship, the best that he can say is 'the head of Samaria is after all only Rezin, and the head of Samaria is but the upstart son of Remaliah, while Jahveh is the head of Jerusalem.' For the last sentence there is no warrant at all. This is strange, for in an earlier note he gives the true interpretation, namely, that Syria and Samaria 'have lost all power for mischief, exhausted by strife with each other and by civil war.' This is what the prophecy must mean if it is to be worthy of its author. Men did not go to

him as to a Sibylline oracle, but because they knew that they should find in him a real and far-seeing adviser, not merely an inspired man, but by reason of his inspiration a practical and trusted adviser.

This has, however, nothing to do with the actual condition of the text save only that it conveys the assurance that the text has a plain message, if we can but find this message.

Our investigation begins with the word ראש (a head), which occurs once in each line of the epigram. My suggestion is that the ר was originally a ד. Next, that the *aleph* was originally a *vau*. This may appear a serious change, but I have to ask my readers to accept my assurance that it is one frequently made by the scribes, on the ground that both *aleph* and *vau* were occasionally omitted as being silent letters—and so became interchanged. Suppose this to have been the scribal reasoning, and we have the true reading דוש, *i.e.* ידוש ('shall trample,' or 'shall harry'). How do we know that this is the true reading? First, because it explains how the false reading came into existence, by the habitual confusion between the two like letters *resh* and *daleth*; and secondly, because, by an undesigned coincidence, it makes 'the rough smooth, and the dark place plain.' The translation is:

> For Damascus shall harry Syria,
> And Rezin shall harry Damascus;
> And Samaria shall harry Ephraim,
> And Remaliah's son shall harry Samaria.

This was the very message needed: the same fate shall befall both your foes, a civil war: and thus Judah shall escape. Such a message was worthy of an Isaiah, both in form and in substance.

MELVILLE SCOTT.

Stafford.

Entre Nous.

Sâdhu Sundar Singh.

Three years ago Professor Heiler of Marburg University published 'Sâdhu Sundar Singh: Ein Apostel des Ostens und Westens.' It has passed through four German editions, and now has been translated into English by Olive Wyon (*The Gospel of Sâdhu Sundar Singh*; Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). The translation is so admirably done that it is quite impossible to detect that it is a translation. In his account of the Sâdhu, Professor Heiler has succeeded excellently in carrying out his avowed purpose 'to seize upon and illuminate the objective and universal element in the Sâdhu's life—his spiritual message. 'My motto has been those golden words of the *Imitatio Christi*: "*Non quaere, quis hoc dixerit, sed quid dicatur, attende.*"' After two brief chapters on the ancestral faith of the Sâdhu and on his life-story—sufficient, however, to give the necessary background—he passes in parts three and four to his spiritual message. Part three is a searching analysis of the Sâdhu's religious life—his *vita contemplativa* and his *vita activa*—and in passing let us say that we have seldom read a book where the arrangement and divisions of the thought are as careful and helpful as here. The most important section in this part is Professor Heiler's picture of the power and inwardness of the Sâdhu's life of prayer. '"Strength, joy, peace"—these are the wonderful effects which Christ leaves in the soul that prays. "I prayed, and peace that passes all understanding filled my heart."'

'In the mountains the rushing streams make their own river bed along which they flow; but in the plains men have to work hard to make canals, in order that the water may flow along them. It is just the same with those who live upon the heights with God. The Holy Spirit streams through them freely, while those who give little time to prayer and communion with God have to find their way with much labour and effort.'

'Prayer makes things possible to men who would otherwise consider them impossible. . . . In very cold regions a bridge of water is a usual sight. For as the surface of the water is frozen hard, the river flows beneath it freely, and people can walk comfortably and safely over the bridge of ice. But, if you were to tell people who live in the heat of a tropical climate that you know of a bridge made of water which spans a flowing river, they would say that such things are quite impossible, and entirely against all the laws of nature. The same great difference exists between those who have been born again, who maintain their spiritual life through prayer, and those who lead a worldly life, who value material things only, and understand absolutely nothing of the spiritual life.'

In giving these quotations we follow Professor Heiler's plan of illustrating each point by quotations from the Sâdhu's own writings. This is specially valuable in what is the most important part of the volume—part four, the religious thought-world of the Sâdhu, which deals with his conception of God, of the Living Christ, of creation, of miracles, of the future life, of the Bible, of sin and salvation. Professor Heiler holds that his conception of sin is coloured by the negative conceptions of mystical theology. In one parable, for example, he tries to show that in itself sin does not exist; it is simply an interruption of the normal life of communion with God.

'One day while I was travelling from America to Australia there was no wireless news; a storm had so disturbed the atmosphere that no message could get through. In the same way sin disturbs the spiritual atmosphere, so that we cannot hear the voice of God.'

The Sâdhu's doctrine of salvation, on the other hand, is thoroughly evangelical. 'The problem of sin and grace,' says Professor Heiler, 'is for him the central problem of Christianity.'

Putting on Christ.

'In the East there are certain insects whose colour and form closely resemble the trees in which they live. Or, what comes to the same thing: there are some trees which exercise such an influence over the insects which live in them, that the latter become like them; for instance, they look exactly like different parts of a tree, such as the bark, the leaf-stalk, or the leaf itself. The tree is the world in which the insect lives, and its influence is so strong that, to some extent, the little creature becomes almost exactly like it. So we become gradually like Christ, as we live in Him and with Him, through the power of His life which works in us. In faith and life, in thought and mind, in temper and behaviour, we must gradually grow like Him.'[1]

Brotherhood.

'Christian ways of life can only be made to work by Christians. I sometimes meet people who propose to adopt the ethics of Christianity while neglecting its spiritual message. They would have us all adopt the principles of Jesus for the guidance of life, but see no immediate necessity for personal religion. Sometimes they would even suggest that the principles of Jesus should be embodied in legislation. And then it is found that on these terms the principles of Jesus will not work. It is very easy, for instance, to talk eloquently about Brotherhood, but those who can only talk about it are very apt in conduct to be found breaking all bonds of fellowship, and introducing fresh animosities into life. . . . For the fact is that to attain to the brotherly attitude of spirit, and to maintain it amidst the contradictions of real life, is a fine spiritual achievement, to accomplish which ordinary people need to sit for long at the feet of Christ.'

Dr. Herbert Gray (*With Christ as Guide*; Williams & Norgate; 2s. 6d. net) has written in non-theological language and as an 'offering to ordinary people' an account of his own religious experience. The quotation above is from the chapter on Christ's practical demands—a chapter which is central to Dr. Gray's mind. To him the truth would seem to be that fellowship with the God whom Jesus revealed can only be maintained by those who in its strength give themselves to such action as they are capable of. The book falls into three divisions—the Personality of Jesus; what follows from trust in Him, namely, belief in God, prayer, and service for the Kingdom; and, third, a more negative section. This deals among other things with the doctrine of the Trinity and with Miracles—it is a plea to the Churches not to exclude those who desire to be loyal to Christ though they cannot accept all the orthodox positions. This is a frank and sincere book, and it might well help many to what they want—consciously or unconsciously—a joyous religion.

'Whosoever loveth.'

'I was once shown a carved ivory ball. On examination it turned out to be a series of carved ivory balls within each other, and all movable. At a first glance, therefore, it seemed a terribly complicated structure. But it was possible so to move the balls about that a hole appeared right

[1] Sâdhu Sundar Singh.

through the whole series, and through that hole the light of the sun passed freely. Human beings also have terribly complicated carved insides—mentally, morally, and spiritually. The mass of our varied moods, obsessions, desires, regrets, ambitions, and fears obstruct almost fatally the light that might penetrate to our hearts. But when love takes real command, the confusion begins to abate, our natures adjust themselves, and into the interior of our lives, thus harmonized by love, the light of God is able to pass.

'Put differently, we may say that he who loves is in essential harmony with the rhythm of the life of God. He is caught up into the pulsations of the Divine nature, for God is love. And therefore it is but natural that He should become aware of his Father. I understand in this way what St. John meant when he wrote, "Whosoever loveth is born of God, and knoweth God."'[1]

Thomas Moult.

This is the fifth year in succession that a volume of 'Best Poems' has appeared. This year Mr. Thomas Moult has selected sixty-nine as *The Best Poems of 1926* (Cape; 6s. net). And if some are hardly poetry we must remember that Mr. Moult restricts his choice to what has appeared in journals—English, Irish, or American—during the year. He excludes poems from published volumes. Most of the stalwarts are represented here—Robert Graves, George Sterling, Wilfrid Gibson, William H. Davies, Louis Golding, Alfred Noyes, A. E., and George Moore. The decorations of the volume by Mr. John Austen are admirable. Perhaps the most finished poem in the anthology is Louis Golding's 'Greece Remembered':

So still this land is, so austere
  Where the dead Greek youth went,
That a man might think it were
  Their sculptured monument.

Yet even in space, yet even in time,
  Like a moon-outlined leaf,
A perfect phrase in a lost chime
  —It was so brief, so brief.

The marble hills stand in the seas,
  The minute seas curl under them:
Even as if Praxiteles
  Had carved it on a gem.

Here is also a sonnet by Archibald Y. Campbell:

Think not of Christ as ever on the Cross;
  Nor let the illustrious or the long-loved names
  Of storied suffering and achievement, fame's
Martyrs, bring thoughts alone of pain, strife, loss.
Not to these always was the world all dross,
  Nor in the throes forever of great aims
  Lived they; if even sage Scipio played light games,
And Emily Brontë strode o'er the upland moss.

Not alone Cana saw glad hours beguiled;
  But many a moment, surely, was there, when,
With friends, and clean fare, and wine sweet and mild,
  And Martha and Mary there; albeit the pen
  Record it not of four plain earnest men,
Peter was mirthful, and the Saviour smiled?

Fay Inchfawn.

The latest of Fay Inchfawn's volumes of collected verse is *Poems from a Quiet Room* (Ward Lock; 2s. 6d. net), and in it we have, what we have now come to expect from her, an illumination of the homely things of life. Here is the shortest poem:

WHEN.

When we see the lilies spinning
  In distress,
Taking thought to manufacture
  Loveliness;
When we see the birds all building
  Barns for store,
'Twill be time for us to worry—
  Not before.

[1] A. Herbert Gray, *With Christ as Guide*, 55.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE subject of Immortality is of perennial human interest, and in recent years many discussions of it have been published. There is a useful chapter on this subject in Dr. W. E. ORCHARD'S *Foundations of Faith—IV. Eschatological* (noticed in another column), where it is presented from a liberal Catholic standpoint in a Christian setting.

With such a theological standpoint Dr. ORCHARD does not feel the necessity of laying much stress upon the rational or philosophical apologetic for the immortality of the soul. It is true he regards the immortality of the soul as the most fundamental of human beliefs, next to the existence of God. But just as Christian theology has been satisfied with admittedly negative proofs of the existence of God, so it rests content with an admittedly inferential argument for immortality. And why so? Because just as the natural basis of belief in the existence of God has been confirmed by the supernatural revelation of God through the Incarnation, so the natural basis of belief in immortality has been confirmed in the teaching and promise of Christ, and more particularly by the astounding revelation of His own Resurrection.

But there are many acknowledging Christ as Lord and Master who find it difficult to subscribe to the distinction between the natural and the revealed as it is formulated in Christian, *i.e.* Catholic theology. Such are inclined to look upon the rational or philosophical apologetic for immortality as by no means 'otiose,' and they would seek confirmation of their belief in immortality in ethical, metaphysical, and scientific considerations.

The ethical or moral argument postulates the truth of immortality in order to find meaning and worth in human existence. It reviews the facts of life and experience, of experience intellectual, moral, and spiritual, in all their incompleteness, and finds in them—for the Soul of the universe is just—a confirmation of the inward assurance of immortality. Thus the moral argument rests ultimately upon the most fundamental of all human beliefs, namely, belief in the existence of God. 'Immortality,' says Dr. ORCHARD, 'is dependent upon the existence of a personal God who loves the souls He has created.'

The metaphysical argument, classically expounded in Plato, seeks to show that the soul is naturally immortal, that in its very nature there is something absolute and eternal. But even if this could be shown, we should not be so very much nearer the conclusion we really want, which is not that the individual soul or self shall survive or continue to live, but that it shall survive in all the fullness of personal self-conscious life.

Modern spiritualism (on which Dr. ORCHARD has some judicious remarks), even if its claims were allowed, appears no more than the old metaphysics of the soul to offer us what we really want. There is

a great contrast, for example, between the 'human survival' after death of which spiritualism speaks and the 'eternal life' of the Christian hope.

The scientific argument is necessarily negative in quality. In the nature of the case one cannot look to natural science to establish so transcendent a truth as this of immortality and the life beyond. But we take it that, so far as psychology as such is concerned, it remains at least an open possibility that the soul may exist apart from the brain as its organ.

Thus, when all is said, the moral argument for immortality, founding on the character and will of Almighty God, remains the strongest. And naturally so, because it is the only argument that is universal in its appeal. Only the few can weigh scientific evidence or estimate the force of philosophical reflections.

Now we may all allow that Christianity reinforces the moral argument. It does this through the new sense of the value of personal life which Christ has brought, not to speak of the belief which it enshrines, that His life was not extinguished at Calvary, that He is alive for evermore in the heavenly world.

Since the days of David Livingstone, some of the most notable contributors to such sciences as geography, ethnography, linguistics, and comparative religion have been missionaries. On the racial and religious problems of Africa, Dr. Donald Fraser has written an unpretentious book which, although aiming at, and succeeding in, being popular, will be found a storehouse of valuable and reliable information. It is entitled *The New Africa*, and provided with a full index, and embellished with four full-page illustrations, is published by The Edinburgh House Press at the modest price of two shillings. The author makes no high claim for himself of his right to be heard on the subject of Africa; he is too humble a man for that. Nor is such a claim necessary; his competence as an observer, recorder, and judge is evident on every page.

There are three points which we may select to give our readers a taste of the book and of its author's qualities—the native religion, the progress of Islam, and the problem of racial contact.

As to native faiths, 'When the hidden depths beliefs of the African take form in the mist that enshrouds them, the sympathetic missionary finds that here, too, God has not left Himself without a witness, and "that which may be known of God is manifest in them." The deeper our knowledge becomes, the more are we convinced that Africa has a religion very sacred to her, and that here is a people deeply and essentially religious, whose faith is woven into the full pattern of their life, appearing everywhere, and giving colour and tone to the web.' The African believes in immortality. He cannot believe that death is natural. 'Death is an accident and not the natural course of events.' Again, he believes in a spirit world. Beings full of mischief and ill-will towards men many of those spirits are. The greater among them are worshipped not by the individual but by the official representative, the priest of the clan or nation. 'Over all this faith the African believes in the great creator God. He is an absentee to them, but it was He who made the world, and was the author of all life. His name is associated with the sky. There are many names for Him in Africa which give to Him some sense of personality and care for the world—the "Nourisher," the "Great Giver," the "Creator," but these names do not bring the ancient source of life very near to the common man. You need not begin to prove to the African that God is. He knows it and has never doubted.'

As to Islam, within comparatively recent times it has undoubtedly been making great headway, not by the sword, as is sometimes supposed, but by peaceful penetration. Dr. Fraser accepts Mr. Roome's estimate that five hundred and sixty-two tribes are wholly Mohammedan, nine hundred and eighty-seven are under Mohammedan influence, and two thousand five hundred and thirty-three are still pagan. 'All these facts must be qualified by others. For example, if somewhere about fifty thousand Mohammedans are now to be found

in the Union of South Africa where none were at the beginning of the last century, in the same time there has arisen a company of one million African Christians.' Again, 'if Islam flows rapidly, it does not flow deep, and its course is stopped, or has dried up where once it seemed to run.' 'One fact remains patent, that where Christianity comes first, Mohammedanism has no chance.'

The problem of inter-racial contact is one of enormous difficulty. Dr. FRASER is fully aware of that. He shows, too, how contact with White civilization has meant for countless Africans a fearful degeneration. The heart of the problem is the individual. 'That is where the test of our Gospel comes in, not in study circles which deeply discuss national and social problems and seek the Christian solution, but in the effort to save this one and that one, souls of priceless value, capable of God, and of claiming His resources. It is necessary that we think, and think bravely and clearly, on the wider bearings of our faith. But it is more necessary that we apply our faith in redemptive action for the souls of men; that, like Christ, we go forth to seek one sheep lost in the wilderness, though there be ninety and nine others to care for.'

'Granted that the very heart of the problem is the individual, have we a key to unlock it? With my whole soul I believe we have, and the key is Christ Himself. I do not mean the Western expression of Christianity, much less Western civilization. These are too faulty. Nor do I mean alone the principles of Christ. It is not higher laws that change men. But I mean Christ, who was dead and is alive again, and who is the Omnipotence of God.'

The attention of readers may be drawn to a fact of considerable importance which has emerged in connexion with a good deal of the religious literature reviewed in these columns. The fact referred to is the indifference displayed by many writers to the value of history or historical fact. In some cases the writers appear to think that it does not really matter whether an event happened or not, so long as the idea behind the event leaves an impression on us. In other cases an event, recorded with every appearance of veracity and vouched for with as strong a basis of evidence as any other in the Gospels, is calmly put aside because it conflicts with a theory of the writer or does not fit into the framework of his particular beliefs.

The most familiar instance of this tendency is the attitude of Catholic Modernism to which the historical facts of the gospel narrative are of indifferent value. They are symbolic. It does not matter whether the thing 'really happened.' What is permanent is the experience of the soul, which the Church exists to promote and foster. This attitude is one of the bad effects left in the mind of our generation (along with very much that is good) by the influence of Pragmatism in philosophy. The indifference to fact and the indifference to metaphysical reality are two results of Pragmatism which are doing a great deal of harm to the cause of truth.

But we see the same tendency to undervalue fact in writers who have no sympathy with Catholic Modernism. To take a typical example from a book recently noticed here, there is the attitude of certain writers to the Resurrection. In the 'Historical Life of Christ,' by Dr. Warschauer, the closing chapter deals naturally with the Resurrection, and the historical evidence for the fact is definitely rejected, a crude form of the Vision Hypothesis being put forward in explanation. But Dr. Warschauer seems to believe that Christ is alive, and he holds this belief, not on the ground of history, but on the ground of the experience of the Christian generations. This is a position maintained long ago by Dr. Dale in a famous book. Although Dr. Dale did accept the historical evidence, he maintained that it was unnecessary and that the belief in the Risen Christ was amply verified by the experience of the ages since Christ rose.

A good example of the disregard of historical evidence may be found in a book reviewed in the present number, *Christianity as Life*, by Mr. Edward GRUBB, M.A. It is an excellent book in most ways, and altogether on the side of the angels. But it is frankly a Quaker interpretation

of the Gospels. And this is how he treats the facts that are unacceptable. There is Christ's teaching on Judgment. That is not harmonious with the Quaker idea that evil can never be overcome by severity. What then does the writer say about a fact which is everywhere in the Gospels, and is attested as well as any fact they contain. He says simply that this teaching is inconsistent with the teaching of love and must have been radically influenced by the current apocalyptic beliefs. In other words, we do not have Christ's real teaching but something He said, modified by beliefs in the disciples' minds.

Similarly, in dealing with the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The Quakers have no sacraments, and the effort of Mr. GRUBB is to show that Jesus never instituted any permanent rite. But St. Paul definitely gives Christ Himself as his authority for the institution of this particular rite. How does the writer meet this? Simply by saying that this is no doubt Paul's way of affirming his conviction of the soundness of the tradition. There are many instances of a similar treatment of history in Mr. Middleton Murry's 'Life of Christ.' But one is not surprised to find them in an essay in which the author claims that his literary training is a good substitute for theological or critical ability. Mr. Murry, for example, believes that the betrayal of Jesus by Judas was a 'put-up job,' arranged by Jesus and Judas between them! How could one expect a serious treatment of history in a writer capable of this *tour de force*?

The serious aspect of the tendency referred to must be obvious to any reflective person. Truth has two sides, the side of fact or reality and the side of subjective apprehension of this reality. The reality may be spiritual, like the existence of God, or historical, like the resurrection of Christ. But you cannot divorce the subjective side from the objective without peril. Take the case of the belief in a living Christ, which is the very soul of any Christianity worthy of consideration. You may say that the experience of the ages substantiates the belief. And that may be true, so far. But if you cut away the historical facts which recreate this belief and confirm it, you not only imperil the belief, but you give some reasonable excuse for scepticism to call the belief an illusion without a basis in solid fact.

Moreover, 'experience' can be found to support any and every belief. Romanists will say that experience supports their belief in Transubstantiation, while there are other churchmen who will say that experience supports their belief in the Sacrament as a merely memorial feast. The touchstone of fact is needed to distinguish the morbid, the individualistic, the arbitrary from the substantial and the real. And, therefore, on the ground of loyalty to truth and on the ground of the interests of a genuine Catholic Christianity, it is time that attention was drawn to the manner in which the facts of gospel history are too often treated. It is true that every statement of historical fact in the Gospels is not to be accepted without careful scrutiny. Let us by all means have a scientific examination of the evidence. But the *arbitrary* rejection of historical statements under the influence of preconceived opinions is not scientific, and we should have a truer and saner view of New Testament history if this caution were more generally observed.

The 'Historical Movement' in the Study of Religion.

By Professor Hermann Gunkel, University of Halle.

THE misconception regarding the historical study of religion which prevails in some quarters had its origin in an interpretation of the words which was not intended by us. Books dealing with non-Biblical religions frequently bear the title 'Universal History of Religion.' From this fact it was held to be a legitimate assumption that the historical study of the religion of the Bible would seek to explain that religion in connexion with the extra-Biblical religions, and interpret Hebrew and

Christian facts as historically dependent on matters that lie altogether outside of them. Opponents of the historical movement add that to their minds this attitude can only mean such a dragging down of what is Biblical to the level of the non-Biblical as to obliterate all difference between them; and they say that such an attitude can only be due to intentional hostility to revealed religion and the Bible.

Now I think I am entitled to say from my own personal knowledge that the words 'History of Religion,' when they were made the motto of the movement, had a far more comprehensive signification. At the time when this movement began, books with the title 'Universal History of Religion' had not yet influenced theological study. The words were not borrowed by us from the works of other men on extra-Biblical religions. The co-operation of lay scholars—valuable as it afterwards became—was at that time almost non-existent. Least of all were we animated by hostility to the Bible or to Christianity. On the contrary, the thoughts that then filled our minds had arisen within theology itself and had a definitively positive character. When we spoke of the 'History of Religion,' we always meant in the first place the History of the Religion of the Bible. We involuntarily conjoined the two great words 'History' and 'Religion,' which had been the guiding stars of our lives. It was our enthusiasm which coined the expression 'History of Religion' in this sense. Before our eyes, uplifting us and bearing us onward, stood a wondrous picture—the Religion of the Bible in all its glory and dignity. We had come to see that such a phenomenon can be understood only when it is understood in its history, in its growth and becoming. It seemed to us to be a sublime task to understand this religion in its depth and breadth, to trace it through its winding course, to be present at the birth of its deepest thoughts.

The question has often been asked how this historical movement arose, and some strange conjectures have been offered. As a matter of fact, it is nothing but a new wave of the mighty historical current set in motion by our great idealist thinkers and poets, which has affected our entire mental life, and has now long influenced our theological outlook also. Indeed, the foundations of the historical movement in theological study are the same as those laid by our teachers Harnack and Wellhausen, although in some details we may have parted company with these honoured men. But we also find our lofty models in the great historians of our nation. Long ago—if I may be allowed to speak of myself—before I knew anything about theology, I found in Gustav Freytag, with his affectionate understanding of the inmost nature of our nation, the model for every student of the history of the human mind; and our sole aim was to apply with strict consistency to the study of the Bible the same principles as are followed in all other historical work, and have long been recognized as natural and valid in that field. That we should meet with so much opposition we, in our inexperience, certainly never imagined; but all the greater has been our joy to find the inward affinity between the lines of study recognized by our lay friends, so that historians, philosophers, and philologists have come to our aid as friends and fellow-workers.

Our first encounter was with the school of Wellhausen to which we ourselves had belonged, and whose great and imperishable work I have never been weary of praising. This school had concluded a dubious alliance between the History of Religion and Literary Criticism—an alliance in which, in our opinion, the former was not allowed its full rights. Here also our attitude was obscured by misunderstandings, and I should like to state here emphatically that we do not dream of opposing Literary Criticism in itself. No one who is acquainted with the condition in which the Bible tradition has come down to us can wish to deny that there is a place for scientific criticism. The critical spirit will last as long as Biblical Science itself, even although the positions adopted by individual critics or schools of criticism—ourselves included—subsequently prove to be erroneous. Further, with the method of research followed by the Wellhausen school, which makes literary criticism the basis of constructive historical work, no fault can be found. The student must, of course, first know what the tradition, after it has been purged from its errors, actually says, before he can proceed to delineate the history that lies behind the sources.

Our objections, therefore, are in no way directed against criticism as such, but against the tendency to postulate an over-close relation between Literary Criticism and the History of Religion. The school of Wellhausen was and still is inclined, in its constructive historical work, to be too subservient to the literary documents, overlooking the fact that special precautions must be taken if the actual history is to be successfully reconstructed from the sources, however carefully these may have been sifted. For example, some of the followers of Wellhausen thought they were safe in dating a thought or a conception in the period in which it

appears in our sources ; but in doing so they have given insufficient weight to the fact that these sources were certainly not compiled with the object of providing after ages with a complete picture of the history of the religion. It is quite possible that a thought, an incident, a conception, a turn of speech, a custom, appearing in our documents at a late period, really belongs to a much earlier age.

But we had another point of difference with Wellhausen's school. They were disposed to pay too little heed to what has *not* come down to us in the literature. How much there is in the life and thought of an ancient people, passing from lip to lip, which never or not till quite a late period appears in the literature ! All the rich content of such oral tradition must be included in our total reckoning, if that reckoning is to be accurate. The Wellhausen school follow too closely the principle, *quod non est in actis, non est in mundo*, and place too much weight on the argument *ex silentio*. For example, because the older narratives of Genesis, as we have them, come to us in the versions of the Jahvist and Elohist, they are ascribed to the dates of these writers, whereas there is no doubt whatever that they go back to a much earlier time, and were merely redacted and edited by these writers or schools of writers. It is another instance of the same procedure when scholars ascribe to an individual writer, whose name has by chance come down to us, what was really the product of a much larger circle of men. An element of the national faith, such as the name ' Jahveh Zebaoth,' was said to be a creation of Amos ; the figure of the Satan was a creation of Zechariah ; and the highly developed Individualism of a later age was declared to be, not the final product of a whole history of civilization and religion, but simply a conception of Ezekiel, whereas Ezekiel was only the first to formulate it clearly and dogmatically.

In this connexion there is another thing that should not be left unsaid. The predominant importance attached to Literary Criticism has also pushed into the background all interest in the history of the literature on its æsthetic side. To be sure, Wellhausen himself is entirely guiltless in this matter. That great and versatile scholar all along devoted much attention to the literary forms of the Old Testament writings, and described in masterly fashion the æsthetic qualities of the Jahvist narrative. Indeed, a school of literary history might have been expected to arise under his inspiration. Things have turned out differently, but there is all the greater reason why we should now make up for lost time and do what has been neglected.

In future, therefore, these two lines of study—the History of Religion and Literary History—should work together. Such co-operation will, we hope, infuse fresh life into the study of Literary Criticism.

There are numerous other points to which reference might be made, but I shall mention only one more—the dryness and lack of interest that characterize so many Old Testament commentaries. This peculiar insipidity of our exegesis is perhaps due to the fact that our scholarship is a direct descendant of Rationalism, and that the revolution which took place in theology at the beginning of the nineteenth century affected our science but slightly and left no lasting impression. Even Wellhausen, who is as far as possible from being a Rationalist, did not succeed in changing this type of exegesis, although we gladly acknowledge that there are many exceptions among the works produced by his school. One of the most urgent tasks of theology to-day is to bring about such a reform of Bible exposition as would lay the main emphasis on the understanding of the *religion* and especially of the religious personalities.[1]

But our objection to the one-sidedness of literary criticism is only one aspect of our historical movement. There is another aspect which is attracting far more attention to-day and which is usually in men's minds when that movement is mentioned. In order to explain what I mean, I may be allowed to go a little further back.

Our historical work is concerned with a book which has always occupied a unique place in the Christian Church and which our fathers have always looked upon as given by God Himself. This special significance of Holy Scripture is the real and actual basis of all Biblical scholarship. It is just because the theory of inspiration—although in principle long ago destroyed or revolutionized—is still working in men's minds everywhere, that all work on the Bible has an interest that it would not otherwise possess. Bible study lives and moves in this special significance of all that concerns the Bible. Should the time ever come—we believe it never will come—when the Bible ceases to be the foundation of the Christian Church, Bible scholarship would also receive a fatal blow.

But, on the other hand, it is also undeniable, that this position of the Bible has sometimes prevented and sometimes retarded the scientific study of it, and that these dangers have not entirely disappeared even now. From its very beginning down to the

[1] This task has been taken up in recent works. See especially the so-called ' Göttinger Bibel.'

present day, all scientific work on the Bible has been an endeavour to break away from the limits of the Canon of Scripture. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, it was found that the Revelation of St. John belongs to the Jewish extra-canonical apocalyptic type of literature, and that it is unintelligible apart from that literature. Even our rationalistic predecessors had had their attention called to the numerous parallels to Biblical narratives supplied by classical tradition. Down to thirty years ago it was the universal practice to restrict Biblical scholarship to the contents of the Canon. The 'Apostolic Fathers,' for example, the ancient Christian literature that immediately succeeded the New Testament writings, were not used in the exposition of the New Testament, although they closely resembled the writings contained in that collection. It was only slowly and reluctantly admitted that the two literatures are to a large extent indistinguishable. It was also maintained that the New Testament was to be explained from the Hebrew Canon, leaving out of account the writings that lie between the Old and the New Testament, the so-called Old Testament Apocrypha. The claim that the eschatology of the New Testament should be interpreted, not from Old Testament prophecy but from contemporary, *i.e.*, late Jewish thought—a claim perfectly clear and almost axiomatic to every student of history—aroused indignant surprise. It was at this juncture, when this tendency had long been in vogue, that the representatives of the historical movement came forward, bringing nothing novel or strange, but merely applying well-known principles of historical study to an epoch of ancient history. Here also in principle we are at one with the Wellhausen school. Whereas previous scholarship had entirely omitted all reference to the religions of other peoples, Wellhausen and his disciples, especially Stade, had studied various primitive religions, in particular that of the Arabs. Pursuing the same path and continuing work already begun, the historical movement took up the study of Babylonian, Egyptian, and Persian religion, and it claims to have shown that at some points, important if not numerous, Hebrew and Jewish religion reveals dependence on foreign influence. These questions have turned out to be of special importance for the study of the New Testament. It is now known from the papyri that at the time of the great turning-point in the history of religion, a pronounced Syncretism, *i.e.* a mixture, combining elements of many older religions, was proceeding in the Hellenistic world; and the question has emerged, whether and to what extent nascent Christianity has drunk out of this stream.

This widening of the horizon took place very slowly, and has only now become generally known. If it cannot be said to have fundamentally changed the attitude of Biblical scholarship, it has at least changed its direction. Just as a man who knows only one language does not really know any language; just as he who studies the history of one state requires to know something of what the life of a state means; so it is our conviction that all religions constitute an essential unit, and that the student of the religion of the Bible must needs know in addition something of Religion as such. As a matter of fact, therefore, Biblical study opens out at this point into the Universal History of Religion. At the same time it must be said emphatically that it was not the effrontery of a few men that led to the taking up of this position; it is inherent in the nature of historical study. If there is to be a real and scientific study of the religion of the Bible—and the interests of the Protestant Church properly understood are deeply concerned that there should be—then there must also be a study of the history of religion in the sense just explained. The numerous risks that attend such a study—and how many faint hearts have raised warning voices over the cradle of this babe?—must not be allowed to frighten us from it. He who seeks the truth always walks on a narrow ledge across the abyss. It has ever been thus and always will be.

The only serious arguments against such an attitude are those which urge that studies of this kind will ultimately destroy the Christian Religion. To the student of history, all religion, including the Christian religion, is a phenomenon of the human mind. But the Christian believes in a Divine revelation. Wherever religion is experienced, it is experienced as an inward communion, a reciprocal converse between God and man, and the religious mind can never surrender this conviction. It would appear, therefore, that a man who tries to deal with history scientifically, and who at the same time feels a deep personal interest in religion and in the Christian Church, must find himself faced by a serious conflict of duties. We are, however, firmly convinced that these two things—the insatiable hunger of the human heart after God and the ineradicable search after Truth—come from one and the same Divine source, and can therefore never contradict each other. *There must be a way out.* But that way out is certainly not the way indicated by a conventional crude Supernaturalism. We are not entitled to select from the course of history

some isolated facts or some entire periods and declare that these and these alone are of God and supernatural. Just as no engineer of our day, who has built with materials of insufficient strength, is entitled to rely on Divine interposition—we should rather call such conduct dishonest—just as no student of natural science, coming upon a phenomenon that he cannot explain, is entitled to take refuge in the supposition that it is due to other than natural causes; so it is simply impossible for an historian to permit fundamental exceptions within the entire course of history. He cannot dissect the history of religion into a part that is revealed and a part that is of man. Were it really the case that sometimes, and no one can say how often, the continuity of Nature is suspended and replaced by something else, there would be an end to all science.

But of course there is a point where the two apparently irreconcilable interests do unite—a point that has long been familiar to every religious mind in all other spheres except Biblical scholarship. In Church History we find the religious and the historical view existing side by side without impinging upon each other in any way. Luther was a gift of God to the German nation. We say that with glad conviction, but we straightway set about discovering how Luther became a reformer. And we do the same with men and events of our own time. We know that we are the offspring of our parents, but we also claim that we and all other creatures have our being from God. We believe in the Holy Ghost who brings us to God, but that does not prevent us from reflecting upon the actual paths by which we have thus been led to Him. And we do the same in practical affairs. We know that the children of a degraded family will in all probability be degraded, but we are conscious of the duty of doing what in us lies to remove them from such conditions, and are sure that he who would limit his efforts in such a case to praying for a miracle would be acting wickedly. We do not expect that God will give the light of the gospel to Darkest Africa without the co-operation of Christendom, and still we render Him praise for every successful missionary effort. Thus the natural human view and the religious view can quite well exist together. Should not the same hold good for the study of the history of religion? Who will interdict the religious historian when he comes to the climaxes of history, or when he reviews its entire course, from folding his hands in reverent silence and realizing that he is at one with the religious minds of all time? As he thus muses, he will say, Wherever a heart has been uplifted to God, however inadequate the forms, in Israel or anywhere else in the world, God has never been far off: whenever His chosen children have tasted of His grace and seen something of His truth, it was He who gave this to them. His name is worshipped among the nations; as the prophet says: North and South lie in the peace of His hands. Over all is the Spirit of God, here in lesser, there in greater fullness. Sometimes it is as if heaven itself were opened, and the Word, which at other times is like seed scattered abroad, itself becomes flesh. 'The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.'

We are sure that the historical movement, by shedding new light on the ancient Scriptures, is truly serving genuine religion. Never do we experience greater joy than when we discover golden treasure where only rubbish has been looked for. There are, it is true, other passages of the Old Testament to which earlier expositors, unable to read them in the light of history, have given meanings derived from later, more developed religion: to these passages our fidelity to truth has compelled us to give a more limited significance.

To our great joy we are receiving an increasing body of testimony from working clergymen, assuring us that they are finding the results of our work serviceable for the edification of their people. It is our hope that the genuine zeal which this movement has produced will carry it further still. As long as such enthusiasm lasts, no foe will be able to hurt it.

When I once more recall the lofty aim which the historical study of religion has in view, and compare with it the poor results we have been able to achieve, my heart is filled with sadness, and in closing I feel constrained to say: 'Do not judge us by what we have done, but by what we have attempted; not by what we have achieved, but by the goal at which we aim.'

Literature.

JAMES WARD.

James Ward, after his article 'Psychology' (1886) appeared in the Encyclopædia Britannica, was regarded as one of the foremost of psychologists. This reputation was established and enhanced by his two sets of Gifford Lectures—'Naturalism and Agnosticism' (1899) and 'The Realm of Ends' (1911), and by his 'Psychological Principles' (1918). We are, therefore, grateful to Professors Sorley and Stout for gathering together in *Essays in Philosophy* (Cambridge University Press; 16s. net) these dozen Essays, for, as some Rabbis said of the text, 'His leaf also shall not wither (Ps 1^3),' it can be said of Ward's works—even his less elaborate sayings have a permanent vitality. Only two of these essays, the first and the last, deal with religious topics: Can Faith remove Mountains (1879), and The Christian Ideas of Faith and Eternal Life (1924)—'the last thing he wrote a few months before his death.' We wish there were more of these, for, as his daughter says, 'He always recognized, and often said that philosophy alone could never greatly ease "the burden of the mystery." His own courageous attitude to life and death was not due to philosophy, but to that instinctive faith in a God which his philosophical writings were largely an attempt to justify' (p. 51).

Essay VIII., 'Heredity and Memory,' combats Weismann's theory of heredity, and No. X., 'Einstein and Epistemology,' discusses critically the implications of the theory of Relativity, the others enforce philosophical principles in the way of criticism and construction which are associated inseparably with his name. The necessity of a percipient for perception, of a knower for knowledge, the selective spontaneity of life, the reality of moral values for the understanding of history—all these are found here.

Much, however, as we value the Essays, we value even more the Memoir (96 pp.), written by his daughter, for it gives us Ward himself as an object of intense interest for the psychologist. Many who know his writings know little of his life, and they will be grateful for this candid Memoir. Here we find the record of one whom no insurance society could accept, living to the patriarchal age of eighty-two. We find one who, Luther-like, felt and fought his soul's dubieties so keenly that at times they seemed like physical antagonists—in short, an intensely interesting record as we follow it in its struggle with straitened and involved family circumstances to the outward peace and ease of academic renown.

Ward's theological difficulties, his somewhat acid temper, his pilgrimage from faith to doubt, which left the first half of his life in shallows and miseries—and then the calmer and mellower season of academic work and growing reputation until he died with—'Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace,' on his lips are all here.

'He had too much philosophy that we might all have a little,' said an admirer. We feel like saying—'He had too little religion that we might all have more,' which is just saying that his life was vicarious. He felt that the serenity of the Upper Room was not for him here while the enemy were seeking to undermine the foundations, so he fought valiantly in the gates; and while he felt his own loss thereby, we recognize that it was a permanent gain for others. 'He kept open the way for faith'—words of Kant often used by himself. We would conclude, adopting Professor A. E. Taylor's words (*Mind*, 1912): 'Our natural impulse is simply to thank God that we have had such a philosopher as Dr. Ward among us.'

A QUAKER INTERPRETATION OF CHRIST.

Still another individualistic presentation of Christianity comes to us, this time from the 'Friends'—*Christianity as Life*, by Edward Grubb, M.A. (Swarthmore Press; 7s. 6d. net). If we leave out the specially Quaker element (but that is like leaving Hamlet out of the play!) the book is an admirable statement of the Gospel facts. Perhaps one ought to modify this praise so far as the author's view of the Person of Christ is concerned. But we shall know about this better when the later volume on 'The Truth of Christianity' appears. Meantime we are thankful for what we have, as an instalment of what seems to promise a number of books on 'The Nature of Christianity.'

The book is divided into four sections: (1) The Religion of Jesus; (2) The New Life (including the 'Pauline Interpretation' and the 'Johannine Interpretation'); (3) The Christian Church (including a long section on the Sacraments); and, finally, (4) a somewhat truncated review of Christianity in Human Life. By far the most interesting sections are the first and third. The first contains the author's view of the life and

ministry of Jesus. It is done with knowledge and in a fine spirit. Everybody will learn something from these fascinating pages. In particular, the treatment of the Temptation is admirable.

But the treatment of the Gospels is marred by the determined effort to force the facts into a Quaker frame. The main thesis is, of course, that love is the way, and that evil is never overcome by force but by gentleness. Any one who maintains that thesis without qualifications is compelled to face the facts: (1) that Jesus preached judgment on Sin; and (2) that He used force in cleansing the Temple. We have not been able to discover here any treatment of the second of these facts. And as to the first, the author rides off on an easy-going horse. The disciples must have misunderstood Jesus about judgment! Another, and minor, example of arbitrary statements in the same connexion is that when Jesus called His disciples to love their enemies, He was demanding, and they probably recognized that He was demanding, forgiveness for the Roman oppressors of the nation.

As a Quaker, the author does not believe in sacraments, and he disposes very readily of the statement that Jesus instituted any sacrament. On broad grounds he thinks that a non-sacramental religion was in the line of the prophetic conception of religion as against a religion of form and ritual, forgetting that the Old Testament prophets were confirmed symbolists. Ezekiel went to an extreme in teaching by symbols. But, apart from this general standpoint, Mr. Grubb asserts that the evidence for Christ's appointment of a sacrament is invalid. And when he is confronted by Paul's claim to have Christ's authority for such an appointment, he says, 'Probably it is a strong assertion of his belief in the truth of the tradition that had come to him.'

There are not a few statements on other points that are as doubtful as the peculiarly Quaker pronouncements. 'The New Age is the age of the Spirit—and the Spirit means for Paul the living personality of Jesus'—that is a fashionable but entirely questionable view of Paul's belief about the Spirit. But it is ungrateful to dwell on differences when we have so much to appreciate, and it is only fair to say that, quite apart from the individualistic element here, Mr. Grubb has given us a book that will help to make the New Testament alive to many.

THE EARLY CHURCH AND THE USE OF WINE.

The Teaching of the Early Church on the Use of Wine and Strong Drink (Columbia University Press; $3.00) is one of the Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law issued under the Sanction of the University of Columbia. Such an origin prepares a reader for a fully documented, well-balanced, and patiently reasoned inquiry. This treatise exceeds expectation, in its dispassionate argument on so many difficult issues, and in the clearness and grace of its style. Its writer, Irving Woodward Raymond, Ph.D., is one of the teachers in Columbia College, and both in his bibliography and his citations, he discloses his mastery of the periods of early Christian Church history. Beginning with an examination of the dictates of Judaism, passing on to an exposition of the Hellenistic-Roman counsels, he reaches a concise statement of the New Testament ideal. Then he traces the increasingly ascetic discipline of the teaching of the Eastern and Western Fathers, and of the customs of the later secular and monastic life. So enlightening is this review that one wonders that this has not been done before. Dr. Raymond definitely declines to be a propagandist. His interest is in the ascertainment of truth rather than in the advocacy of any new point. Yet one may surmise that the reading of these pages would be more agreeable to a prohibitionist than to the advocate of another view. The deepest impression left is the concern of all moral teachers in every age, because of the manifold cost, and the unbearable curse of drunkenness—so universally bound up with a free use of wine. The only critical remark to be made is that this finely ordered survey is concerned chiefly with the use and abuse of wine. It has little reference to 'strong drink.' It does not allude to the use of alcohol, in the forms common to-day.

DEAN INGE.

Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. have issued a new edition, at 3s. 6d. each, of the two volumes of Essays by the Dean of St. Paul's, so well known under their frank and somewhat egotistical title *Outspoken Essays*. The first volume was published (or at least its contents were) about eight years ago, and it was this volume that procured for its author the reputation for gloomy pessimism that has stuck to him. The reputation is not really deserved. It is true the Dean has an uncomfortable habit of calling a spade a spade. He looks at the condition of the present-day Church and says his real say about it. He thinks little, for example, of the recruits that are being received into the ministry. The preaching is feeble, ministers interfere in an

ignorant fashion in things they know little about, such as economic problems and industrial disputes. They are too much interested in ecclesiastical millinery and too little in truth. One reason why the Church attracts such poor stuff to its pulpit is that there is a general belief that a man cannot preach the Gospel without doing violence to his scientific conscience. The current conflict, too, between science and religion is in many ways injurious, and truth cannot be suppressed by mere authority.

These are some of the opinions that have earned for the Dean of St. Paul's his sombre repute. And there are others, of course, such as his scepticism of the inevitableness of progress. But, on the other hand, as these volumes amply testify, Dr. Inge is a robust believer, with a creed that is substantially conservative, though eccentric, or at least individual on certain matters. And no man with his faith could be a pessimist. On the other hand, his directness, his almost brutal sincerity, his vision, his independence, and his breadth of view make him a priceless asset to the cause of religion. If we had many Inges, or even Ingelets, in our pulpits, who would blurt out truth, however disconcerting, the cause of religion would be greatly advanced. These two volumes, in their cheapened form, will do a great service to the Church and to all that the Church stands for.

———

WHICH JESUS?

Good sermons are always welcome, and some collections even sell well. Whether this is because people like to read, as well as hear, good sermons, or for some more utilitarian reason, is not clear. At any rate, here is a volume of sermons worth reading, as they must have been worth hearing: *Which Jesus? Young Britain's Choice*, by the Rev. J. H. Howard, M.A. (Evans, Dolgelley; 3s. 6d. net). They were all delivered to a congregation first, and some of them were afterwards heard on big Church occasions. The title is from the first sermon, in which the preacher uses a fact, if it be a fact, mentioned in the Armenian version of one of the Gospels, that Barabbas was called Jesus. So that Pilate's question was put in this striking fashion: 'Whom will ye that I release unto you, Jesus Barabbas or Jesus the Christ?' That is a good introduction to a volume of sermons, and whets the appetite for more of the same. And there is more—all sound, cultured preaching, with literary illustrations, and in the modern spirit.

JAMES NAYLER.

Miss M. R. Brailsford, the author of 'Quaker Women,' has written a spirited and sympathetic account of James Nayler, George Fox's most distinguished convert—*A Quaker from Cromwell's Army: James Nayler* (Swarthmore Press; 6s. 6d. net). An interesting introductory chapter on 'Cromwell's Quaker Soldiers,' in which, among other things, the relation of those early Quakers to the doctrine of non-resistance is set forth, leads to the moving and poignant tale. It is Miss Brailsford's aim and endeavour to rescue Nayler's name from obloquy, and to restore him—pilloried and branded as he was for spiritual pride and blasphemy—to a place at Fox's side as a Founder of Quakerism but little inferior to his leader. She has been successful in showing how his six months of defection, for which he underwent the extreme of man's cruelty, were preceded by six strenuous and self-sacrificing years of eloquent evangelism, and were more than atoned for in the last brief term of his life, wherein he appeared a veritable apostle of humility and Christlike love. 'One seems to see him in those last months of his life: a man prematurely aged, disfigured by the hangman's branding and broken by stripes; a minister disowned by his leader and debarred from his fellowship, yet going in and out of the Quaker meetings, like another beloved apostle, with the message upon his lips: "Little children, love one another."'

———

One of the most human books on some aspects of the Missions problem is *An Uphill Road in India*, by M. L. Christlieb (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net). It is really an edited collection of letters sent home to a former fellow-worker. All the laughter and some of the tears of the missionary's life are here. The descriptions of Indian village life and homes are excellent, and not a few of the incidents are movingly told in simple, unaffected style which adds to their impressiveness. 'There is an idea abroad,' says the authoress, 'that converts, simply because they are converts and have left an old faith for a new, must be better representatives of Christianity than those to whom its truths have long been familiar. They are credited with the virtues of saints, the fortitude of martyrs, the untiring enthusiasm of idealists. Whereas, generally speaking, while faithfully following a new gleam of light, and proving their loyalty to Jesus Christ often by heroic sacrifices, they also bring with them the

deeply rooted habits and ideas of the former atmosphere. The grandeur of the Christian character is not attained by any of us at a leap; certainly not by those handicapped by the delusions, disorders, and darknesses of their old environment.' Many of the incidents illustrate just how true that observation is.

The new Prayer Book is creating some stir in Anglican circles. Perhaps that is putting the matter gently. Nobody seems *quite* satisfied with it. Some people are excessively dissatisfied with it. But, on the whole, most of the different 'schools' in the Church seem prepared to accept it, in default of something more to their mind. It would be tragic if the issue were different, for this book represents twenty years' labour, and a genuine effort has been made to be inclusive. That this effort has not been fruitless is proved by a book which should be in every Anglican's hands: *The New Prayer Book* (being a course of public lectures delivered at King's College, London, by eight lecturers, representing various schools of thought in the Church), edited by Professor H. Maurice Relton, D.D., with a foreword by the Archbishop of Canterbury (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d.). The lecturers are Dr. Relton, Miss Evelyn Underhill, Professor F. R. Barry, Rev. A. S. Duncan-Jones, Canon Storr, Canon E. S. Woods, Rev. Francis Underhill, and Dr. W. R. Matthews. All of them, from different points of view, urge the acceptance of this book, and one could not get a better proof of its sane comprehensiveness.

Dr. W. E. Orchard publishes the fourth of his series of four popular volumes on the *Foundations of Faith—IV. Eschatological* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). The first was 'Theological,' the second 'Christological,' the third 'Ecclesiological,' and this last is 'Eschatological,' being concerned with the doctrine of the Last Things. It should be noted that this volume contains an Index to the whole work. Its contents are on the lines of a Dogmatic Eschatology, the chapters treating of such subjects as Immortality, Death and Resurrection, Judgment, Purgatory, Heaven, and Hell. The treatment is clear and thoughtful, the standpoint that of a free or liberal Catholicism. In a concluding chapter the author identifies the future of humanity with the future of Christianity.

A series of little books, called Benn's Sixpenny Library, is being issued, each of them written by a specialist, and all of them seeking to cover the field of human knowledge. The first twelve of the series, *e.g.*, included *A History of England*, by D. C. Somervell; *English Literature*, by Professor C. H. Herford; and *Modern Scientific Ideas*, by Sir Oliver Lodge. Other titles, taken at random, are *The Mind and Its Workings*, by C. E. M. Joad; *The Development of Political Ideas*, by Professor F. J. C. Hearnshaw; and *Relativity*, 'an Exposition without Mathematics,' by James Rice, M.A. There are about eighty pages in each book, with bibliographies, and all done in a popular way. There are already well on towards two hundred volumes, and those sent to us seem admirable examples of intelligible exposition.

We welcome a volume of sermons by representative ministers of the Free Church of Scotland. It has been published by the Publications Committee of that Church, with the title *The Free Church Pulpit* (4s. 6d. net). The sermons are the message of men who believe in the supreme importance of preaching. 'There is no pretence of attaching first importance to literary expression, or of dealing with all the aspects of the Faith; but the sermons are the utterances of men who regard preaching as supremely worth while, and in each case they are indicative of the personal traits of the writers.' The choice of the writers is an excellent one, and it is due to the Rev. John Macleod, O.B.E., of Glasgow, who is the convener of the Committee responsible for the publication, assisted by the Rev. Alexander Stewart, D.D., Rev. P. W. Miller, B.D., and the Rev. W. Macleod, M.A.

From the Friends' Book Centre comes a moving and charming account of early Quaker life and adventure in America—*Nancy Lloyd: The Journal of a Quaker Pioneer*, by Anna Lloyd B. Thomas (7s. 6d.). Nancy was the daughter of Governor Lloyd of Pennsylvania, who was the close and devoted friend of William Penn. We are allowed to see in the artless prose of this young girl the hesitations and preparations in England, and the early struggles of the pioneers in America, along with a domestic life and a tender romance of delicate beauty. Quaker literature is extraordinarily appealing, perhaps because of its nearness to Nature, its simplicity, and sincerity. And this story will make a strong appeal, because it possesses these qualities in every part. The book is not unworthy to be placed on the shelf alongside the Journal of John Woolman.

If, like so many more, you are fascinated but often puzzled by the poetry of Francis Thompson, get a little book, *Francis Thompson and his Poetry*, by Rev. T. H. Wright (Harrap ; 2s. net). The aim is to illustrate the life of the poet by his work, and to interpret his work in the light of his life. The treatment is clear yet penetrating, deep-going but with never a dull line.

Bishop H. Hensley Henson has published, under the title *Church and Parson in England* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 5s. net), four sermons ('The Lordship of Jesus,' 'The Church of England,' 'Robertson of Brighton,' 'The Christian Ministry') and six Ordination Addresses, in which he seeks to set out the great assumptions of the Christian ministry and to indicate the conditions of extraordinary difficulty under which that ministry must now be carried on. Of special interest to preachers will be the third of the Ordination Charges, dealing with the pastoral sermon (as distinguished from the controversial, academic, occasional, special, and evangelistic). The volume abounds in wise and weighty teaching and direct counsel, and strikes a lofty spiritual note. A feature of it is the happy use it makes of the older writers on the Christian ministry, like Fuller and George Herbert.

The best thing of all is truth, and when your mind is settled on a foundation of truth, you know where you are, so to speak. But that is just what many people in the churches do not know. And for them, so far as they are Free Churchmen, a book has been written to let them know where they are and on what truth they stand. It is called fitly *The Goodly Heritage of the Free Churches*, and the author is Mr. H. Jeffs (Independent Press ; 1s. 6d. net). Mr. Jeffs vindicates the independent existence of Free Churches on grounds of Scripture, history, and spiritual results. He traces Free-Churchism in the Old Testament. He traces it through the ages. He describes the origin of the different Free Churches. He points out what they have done and what they stand for to-day religiously. And, if it is said, 'Oh yes, but the witness of these Churches is exhausted ; the duty to-day is to merge in the National Church,' he replies, 'No, thank you. We welcome co-operation, but such a "merger" is unthinkable. We are members of the Catholic Church and function better separately and in variety.' Well, that is a point of view. And, in any case, we want all Churchmen of every complexion to be intelligent Churchmen, and such a book as this will help to that end in one direction.

Mr. George Stewart, the Principal of Skerry's College, has broken new ground and done a good bit of work by writing *The Story of Scottish Education* (Pitman & Sons ; 5s. net). There are any number of histories of individual schools, and most of the larger guide-books to our Scottish cities and towns give the salient points in the story of their respective educational institutions. But strange as it seems, the history of Scottish education as a national concern has never before been told in any fullness. It is a fascinating story and one of which no Scotsman has any need to be ashamed. We have it well told here.

A book of reflections, with the title *Light My Candle*, has been prepared under interesting circumstances. It is the joint work of Dr. Henry Van Dyke and his son, the Rev. Tertius Van Dyke (Revell ; $2.00). In the ordinary course of work each wrote down 'briefly and carefully, the reflections which came to him about life, and the faith which animates life, and the hope which gives it the promise of immortality, and the love human and Divine which makes it worth living.' One is an old man and the other hardly middle-aged. Their fields of work were different and far apart, yet when the reflections were put together the writers themselves asked, 'Did you write that or did I?' There was no deliberate uniformity but a unity of purpose which sprang from a common conviction. This volume might be used fruitfully for daily readings.

Messrs. Skeffington have published a timely volume containing *Twenty Harvest Homilies* (3s. net). The studies are short, but their style is in no way spoilt by this, and they gain in pointedness. They are edited by the Rev. John Henry Burn, B.D., the Rector of Whatfield, and he has brought his very considerable experience to bear in his choice of contributors. We quote one of the sermons in 'The Christian Year' this month—'The Thankful Spirit.' It is by the Bishop of Birmingham. We have retained his own spelling, on which he writes the following explanatory note : 'In revising the spelling I hav tried to approximate to phonetic spelling cheefly by adopting older forms : e.g., "hevenly" and the like belong to the sixteenth century ; and forms like "wou'd" and "cherisht" were used in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. "Beleeve" is found in the

A.V. of 1611. Forms like "liv" and "hav" follo an old analogy of shedding a silent final "e." It is indeed well to retain some spellings which ar inconsistent with the pronunciation; but if, *e.g.*, we retain the "k" in "kno," the etymology of the word is sufficiently respected without retaining the hideous final "w," which suggests that the word rimes with "cow." Many of the phonetic spellings which I use ar taken from the P.B. of 1549 and the Bible Version of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.'

Another timely book published by Messrs. Skeffington is *Nature—the Art of God*, by the Rev. G. T. Shettle (2s. net). There are ten addresses in it on Sunshine, Flowers, Summer, Autumn, Trees, and other Nature subjects. Much of each address is concerned with the phenomena of Nature. The author has a power of attractive description very finely developed.

Three other books which come to us in the familiar and artistic grey paper jacket of Messrs. Skeffington —*Dreamers in Action* (2s. net), six short studies in religious enthusiasm; *Wisdom from the Wise* (5s. net), and *Tonics for the Times* (3s. 6d. net). The author of *Dreamers in Action* is the Rev. E. H. Rudkin, M.A., B.D., Rector of Ninfield. Any profits derived from the sale of this book are to go to the alterations of the church buildings at Ninfield. *Tonics for the Times* is by the Rev. William Aaron. It contains fifty-two short talks, one for each Sunday in the year. *Wisdom from the Wise* is a book of readings for every day of the year. Each contains a short meditation by the author, Mr. M. Schack-Sommer, on the text, followed by some suitable quotation.

Popular apologetic is of different kinds, some of it not very popular, and some of it not very convincing. But the most effective efforts of this kind are those of men who are accustomed to meet the enemy in the gate. Professor C. F. Rogers, of the Chair of Pastoral Theology in King's College, London, has this excellent outfit, for he has been accustomed to deal with hecklers in Hyde Park and to hold the fort against all comers. He knows the plain man's difficulties and has met them in *Lectures in Hyde Park: If we believe in God* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net). This is a second series of such discussions, the first being on 'Why men believe.' The subjects of this second series are Free Will, the Problem of Pain and Theism, and Ethics. Professor Rogers handles these themes in no academic fashion. He has his eye always on the ball. The discussions are in the best sense popular, and they are really a persuasive apologetic such as will appeal to the man in the street.

An excellent little book in the line of popular apologetic is *Then Shall We Know*, by Miss C. L. Maynard (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net). While the line of argument is to a small degree original, what is familiar is freshly and persuasively expressed. The main topics handled are such as the reality of the spiritual; the relations of Science—'a firm foundation with no house above it in which the soul of man can dwell'—to Religion, which 'supplies a beautiful superstructure with apparently inadequate foundations'; personality, human and divine; sin; prayer; Christ. The devotional spirit in which the whole treatment is set adds to the charm of the book.

In 1921 a history of *The Quakers* in England was written by Mr. A. Neave Brayshaw, B.A., LL.B. A second edition has just been issued (Swarthmore Press; 5s. net). The original work has been largely rewritten and a new chapter has been added on the beginning of Quakerism in America and on the work of William Penn. This volume might very well be read along with 'The Faith and Practice of the Quakers,' by Dr. Rufus M. Jones, for it is at our peril that we neglect the message of the Quakers. In the new chapter there is an account of early American persecution. 'Terrible is the story of ten years' persecution, fines, imprisonment, appalling flogging of men and women publicly under the Cart and Whip Act (one man was flogged nine times for allowing a meeting to be held in his house), and on Boston Common, in the years 1659–1661, one woman and three men were hanged. Never did martyrs go to their death with more triumphant assurance of victory; William Leddra, straitly shut up in a cold, dark room "little larger than a saw pit," chained to a log, thus wrote on his last day of this life:

'"The sweet influences of the Morning Star like a flood, distilling into my habitation, have so filled me with the joy of the Lord in the beauty of holiness that my spirit is as if it did not inhabit a tabernacle of clay, but is wholly swallowed up in the beauty of eternity, from whence it had its being. . . . As the flowing of the ocean doth fill every creek and branch and then retires again toward its own being and fulness, leaving a savour behind, so doth the life and power of God flow into our hearts, making us partakers of His Divine nature."'

There is no language of prayer that has the moving appeal of Bible language. Pulpit prayers that are redolent of Scripture are extraordinarily uplifting. And, therefore, the Rev. David T. Patterson has done a real service in bringing together, and publishing, *Great Prayers of the Bible* (Williams & Norgate; 2s. 6d. net). The book is divided into two parts: (1) Personal Prayers, and (2) Community Prayers, and there are clear sub-divisions in both parts—Praise, Confession, Intercession, and for certain human conditions like trouble. Ministers who do not actually use these prayers (and they might do worse) might, at least, fill their minds with them, and go to their pulpit or prayer-desk with the aroma and the language of them in their memories. An admirable book.

If any readers are interested in conventual life, or wish to see its best side, they can do so in *The House of Refuge*, by Miss E. Hamilton Moore (Williams & Norgate; 3s. 6d. net). The book is really a mystical picture of the soul's rest and peace in a retreat where kindness and piety mingled make the retreat a real refuge. The charm of the book is its simple and loving spirituality, and it is probable that there are many worried souls who would find a 'refuge' in its pages.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Television.[1]

'Their speech has never a word, not a sound for the ear, and yet their message spreads the wide world over, their meaning carries to earth's end.'—Ps $19^{3.4}$ (Moffatt).

Do you ever read the papers, except that Hammond's made another century, and Yorkshire are beaten again? Well, did you notice a wonderful thing that happened the other week—how some people in Glasgow saw some others in London? 'O-o-oh,' you say. 'That's a big one.' Yes, but they did! They saw a boy, a London boy; and they in Glasgow, speaking over the wireless, asked him to do things, and he did them. 'Put out your tongue,' they said, and out it came, and they, hundreds of miles away, saw him. How? Well, they tell us it's quite simple; but it's too clever for me. Did you ever get stuck up in a sum, and take it to the teacher, and she said, 'Oh, that's an easy one. You see this, and that, and something else (and you didn't!); so that's quite simple, isn't it?' And you said, 'Ye-es'; and went back more puzzled than ever. Well, this is like that. I'm more puzzled after they are done explaining than before. But it seems that everything makes a sound—everything. So Mother needn't be so down on you for being noisy! Everything's noisy. A cabbage looks pretty sleepy. But it's screaming away all the time. And a chair, and a table, yes, and your face. No, not your mouth, your face. And your face makes one sound and my face quite another sound. Got that? Well, it seems that all sounds are really little waves that go rippling along. And what they have done is to make an instrument that turns that London boy's face into its own sounds and directs these to (say) Glasgow, and then in Glasgow there is another instrument that catches the sounds when they arrive, and turns them back into the face again. Do you follow? No. Good. Neither do I; not one bit. So you and I will go and sit at the foot of the class, and talk about something else.

Suppose we speak about this—What sound does your face make? No, no, I don't mean that. I know baby's always crying; and that you are always racketing about and getting into trouble for it. I know you can sing and whistle. Can you do the kind with two fingers—the long, shrill one? I never could. All my life it's been a great disappointment; but, of course, you can't have everything. But what sound does your face make? For we've always had a kind of television, we've always been sending out sounds, though we didn't know it, and people far away turn them back into our faces, see these quite clear beside them there half across the world. There are boys at the other end of the earth up against things, tempted, going to give in and do something horrid. And suddenly they see their Mother's face! But, you say, she's hundreds and hundreds of miles away. Yes. But as she runs about the house at

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

home, doing little kindnesses, and putting through the daily tasks, her face is sending out sounds that go right across the world and grow into her face again out yonder. And her boy sees it, sees how vexed she used to look when he did something mean or wrong, sees how vexed she would be now if he gave in to this temptation. And 'No,' he says, and sticks to it. 'No, I will not.'

That's how Jesus Christ helps people. You remember that once Peter was doing very badly, and through the crowd he caught a glimpse of Christ's face looking at him—oh, so sadly; and that pulled him together. Well, it's like that. It's hundreds of years since Jesus lived on earth; and it was far away even then. But even yet when people feel greedy and grabby and selfish and cross, and their tempers are rising, and their mouths are opening to say horrid things, the way He used to live calls up His face, and they just can't do it, not with Him looking at them clearly there. Do you never see Him? It would help you, too, when your fists are doubling and your passions flaming up.

Your face is making some sound too. But what kind is it? Does it help others, or does it tempt them? Does it make them better, or does it make them worse? Is it easier for them to go straight when they think of you, or do you lead them wrong? There is no voice, says the Psalmist, there are no words heard! Yet always, always, we are sending out sounds round about us, and these grow into our face; and, when they see it, are the boys and girls that you know helped or tempted? Do they do better, or worse?

Drowning Nenuphars.[1]

'I am . . . the lily of the valleys.'—Song 2^{1}.
'And he that seeketh, findeth.'—Mt 7^{8}.

What is a drowning nenuphar? Perhaps you don't all know. I can't blame you. Perhaps not many people do know. The words are found in a lovely poem. It is by our Poet Laureate, Mr. Robert Bridges, and it is called, 'There is a Hill.' This is the first verse:

There is a hill beside the silver Thames,
Shady with birch and beech and odorous pine;
And brilliant underfoot with thousand gems
Steeply the thickets to his floods decline.
Straight trees in every place
Their thick tops interlace,
And pendant branches trail their foliage fine
Upon his watery face.

[1] By the Reverend Cecil Nicholson, Darwen.

In the fourth verse the poet speaks of a place—

Where spreading crowfoot mars
The drowning nenuphars.

What is a drowning nenuphar? I want to tell you two things that it is.

1. It is *something to find out.* It is always interesting to have something to find out. To have things to find out is sometimes better than to have the things. When you see a word you don't know, try to find out what it means. When you see a fresh sight or hear a strange sound, find out what it is. Do it always. It is often more interesting to find things out than to watch a game. You must, of course, be careful how you try to find out. Don't be like the boy whose father brought him a drum from a fair, and who burst it open to find out where the sound came from; or like the girl who planted seeds in her garden, and who, three days afterwards, went turning up the soil to see how they were growing. Don't be like that, but do find things out. You can all be detectives and discoverers. The world is full of a number of interesting things. Why has a cat whiskers? Why do frogs croak? How do blue-tits hang on a string? —just tie up a piece of fat and try them. Even in the house there are many things. How does the water boil? How does the vacuum clean? How does the loud speaker speak and sometimes squeak? You will find the world getting 'curioser and curioser' as Alice said in Wonderland. Life will be far more pleasant and far more useful if you find out things.

The whole of school life is a process of finding out, and it is always better to find things out for yourself. Don't expect the teacher to tell you everything. School is like that because life is like that. Some of the greatest men have been boys who tried to find out. Watts, who invented the steam-engine, found out what steam could do by playing with a kettle. Benjamin Franklin found out about electricity by playing with a kite. Edison and Marconi are great inventors because they have all their lives been trying to find things out. That is what great explorers and travellers do: David Livingstone crossing Africa, brave men climbing Mount Everest, and the men who set out in wonder ships and aeroplanes to explore the icy lands and seas that lie about the poles. They go to find out, as Kipling says:

Something hidden, go and find it, go and look behind the ranges;
Something hid behind the ranges, lost and waiting for you, go!

It is just the same when you want truth and beauty and goodness and love. As long as ever you live you can go on finding. You will never in this world find all, but there will always be the joy of seeking: the joy that Jesus had when He was twelve years old, when He sat in the Temple in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions. One of life's best joys is like the first thing about a drowning nenuphar. It is something to find out.

2. It is *something beautiful when found.* There are some things in the world which are not worth finding. It is not so with 'drowning nenuphars.' They are beautiful when found. I know, because one day I found some. I was walking in a park and I came to a little side path. It was narrow and winding and shrub-bordered, and it tempted me. I strayed into it. I found it led downward, and at the bottom there was a shallow pond, and in the pond some drowning nenuphars—Water-lilies. Water-lilies, beautiful when found. You had to seek them, but they were worth seeking.

As I said, not all the things we seek are worth finding. For some things it is better to wait until they come to us. There is a curiosity which brings a sting, but lilies are always worth finding, because, when you find them, they are beautiful.

Our Lord Jesus has been called a Lily, and He is best worth finding of all the things that we can seek. 'He that findeth Jesus findeth a good treasure, yea, a good beyond all.' We must seek Him until we find Him for ourselves, and when we find Him we must cling to Him and love Him. Then we shall know Him to be the fairest and sweetest and best of all that lives or is upon the earth.

The Christian Year.

Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity.

Spiritual Freedom.

'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.'—2 Co 3^{17}.

The City of Destruction has been left behind, but the pilgrims' way to the City that hath foundations is not only long, but wearing. Still, they toil and aspire and strive to attain, but are sorely hindered in the way, and the one thing they have not, as they expected to have, is freedom. Rousseau opened his *Contrat Social* with the famous words, 'Man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains.' The Christian's inheritance is real and substantial, but to some it seems to be so encumbered with debts and mortgages that they fail to enjoy and to benefit by it.

1. Few words have been more abused than that of liberty. Madame Roland's often quoted exclamation, 'O Liberty, what crimes have been committed in thy name!' may really have run, as we are now told, 'How thou hast been played with!' Both are true. But even worse than playing fast and loose with a sacred name is that its very meaning is so continually misunderstood.

Often liberty implies absence of restraint from without, at the hands of some state or community, or of some lord or master, or in relation to certain regulations and restrictions. The civil and religious liberty for which men have had sometimes so long and so earnestly to contend means the removal of all unjust restraints upon citizens as regards their beliefs or actions. Many can think of no other 'liberty' than this. The chains to which Rousseau referred were those of unrighteous laws, of injurious privilege, of proud oppression, or the artificial restraints of an iniquitously constituted social order; and he pleaded with enthusiastic rhetoric that these might be removed, and then the primeval reign of liberty would return. The men of the French Revolution of 1789 believed him, and shouted, 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity,' only to find themselves under the dominion of a harder tyrant than ever.

Such freedom should never be undervalued. Its attainment is worth many a sore conflict, and those martyr souls deserve immortal honour who have lived and died to obtain it for their successors, if not for themselves. But when this liberty has been obtained, man has not yet begun to live. All just opportunity has been provided for each to think and act for himself, so far as state or society can provide it—no more. What will a man do with that 'free hand' he has been so anxious to secure?

2. What man really wants in his craving for 'liberty' is power; power for himself, as a living creature with certain faculties, to be himself—in thought, word, and deed, to work out his own nature without let or hindrance. Power to be himself, but what is himself? Each man has so many selves. It is sometimes said that in each is a higher and lower self, but, if we think of the moods and changes, the varying conditions without and within, of one individual life, it is hard to say what the real self is. If full scope is given to lower impulses, what is to become of the higher? Hence arises an inner conflict, of which every son of man knows something, and the best know most. When Racine read his play of 'Esther' to Louis

Quatorze, and came to the passage which describes the cruel civil war between higher and lower natures within the soul, the Grand Monarque interrupted him, 'I know that war very well.' (Epictetus, the crippled slave, stood in an upper form of the school of humanity in which kings and sages have often proved themselves dunces and dullards.)

To realize the highest Self—if this were but as easy as men have dreamed! 'We needs must love the highest when we see it,' but we soon find how impossible it is to make it our own.

One word has thus far been obviously and intentionally omitted—God. It is because He is left out of the calculation that so many in their search for happiness, and others in their endeavours after self-realization, utterly fail. Direct attempts to secure these high ends always fail. The only way to secure happiness is not to strive after it for its own sake, but to take the course that leads to it, the path where it will always come in by the way. The only way to secure true realization of Self is not to concentrate thought upon self in attaining the great ends of being. God, who is Spirit, has created spirits in His own image, and we are so made that true self-realization is possible only through harmony with Him who has made us and the Order of which He is the centre and the goal. The truth of the gospel is made known, the message uttered and reiterated, it may be with eloquent lips, but it is of no avail till the Holy Spirit brings it home to the heart and enables the penitent believer to make it his own. Thus it is *that* moment which makes the epoch in a life, as the soul 'finds Christ,' or 'enters into liberty.' Henry Ward Beecher describes in a passage of autobiography 'that blessed morning in May when I found out that it is God's nature to love man in his sin for the purpose of helping him out of it, as my mother loved me when I was in trouble that she might help me out of it. Then I found God.'

3. The pity is that the brightness of the morning fades away so soon. The infant Church found it so when Pentecostal joys were over. The religion of the average member of the Christian Church to-day is far removed from the spontaneous activities, the unfettered exercise of powers in sheer delight, of those who ate their bread in gladness and singleness of heart, praising God and having favour with all the people.

When the early liberty of the enfranchised soul is in danger of being lost, is not one reason that men lose the keen sense that they are not under the law, but under grace? Having begun in the Spirit, they would fain be perfected in the flesh. At the moment of first forgiveness it was the astonishing and overwhelming sense of undeserved grace that transformed the whole landscape. Later on, the message of grace may seem too good to be true. The fact is, it is too good not to be true, because it is God in Christ with whom we are dealing, God the Spirit who brings into liberty. Law brings into bondage, love delivers. Law restrains, prescribes, prohibits; love spurns hindrances, prompts, impels, renews, exhilarates; one animating and dominating energy gives the secret of all glad effort to those who are freed from law and constrained by grace. Such servants of God are sons indeed; they do not toil in walking, but fly straight to their mark like the eagles and the angels. 'The lover flies, runs, and rejoices,' says Thomas à Kempis; 'he is freed and cannot be held. Love feels no burden: counts no pains, exerts itself beyond its strength; talks not of impossibility, for it thinks all things possible and all permitted.' 'Love and do as you like,' the doctrine propounded by Luther, sounds dangerous enough, and the maxim has often been shamefully abused. But it is the safest of all doctrines, the only abidingly safe doctrine, provided the love is pure and supreme. He who loves is free. Then shall I run the way of Thy commandments, when Thou shalt set my heart at liberty.

4. All this is not inconsistent with a considerable measure of conflict, else the doctrine would miss its hold of actual life. So far from being inconsistent, it is in and through conflict that liberty is reached, that power is realized, developed, increased. It is in conflict that the lessons of love are learned, the meaning of love understood, the capacities of love unfolded, applied, multiplied. Conflict may be sharp and painful, and yet welcomed because of its results; conflict becomes joy when enemies are base and triumph is assured. Temptation itself, like unbelief, may be—

Kept quiet like the snake 'neath Michael's foot,
Who stands calm, just because he feels it writhe.

But it is well to face the facts. A man who walks by the Spirit is not freed entirely from the tremendous power of past habits. He is not freed entirely from the conflict of desires, recognized in Gal 5^{17}—a verse which contains a graphic description of many a Christian life.

One single false strain in the character may be of itself sufficient to bring into bondage the whole of an otherwise emancipated life. It is possible to be held to earth by only one band. It may sound hard when St. James says, 'If a man keep the whole

law and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.' But put it another way: how if one course of disobedience be enough to show the hidden mischief that is at work and bring all the rest of the life to ruin? One quivering tongue of flame is enough to show that the house is on fire. One spot of tubercle in the lung frightens the physician and the patient. One crack in the wall of the reservoir may let loose a flood that will sweep away whole villages in its train. Lancelot, so noble and chivalrous, fell by one fault, all that was pure and good in him clinging

Round that one sin, until the wholesome flower
And poisonous grew together, each as each,
Not to be pluck'd asunder.

And when all the facts of our difficult life are taken into account, it might seem as if spiritual freedom were impossible.

5. Liberty is attainable only through the Holy Spirit. As many as are led by the Spirit are not under the law. So it comes to pass in the course of Christian experience, as at its happy beginning, a Breath comes from above which we can hear, but not see, and does its own work of enfranchisement in the struggling soul. The breath of our own spirit is not nearer or surer, but with an infinite energy which mocks our puny endeavours the Divine Power lifts, wafts, bears the spirit on and up, far beyond the regions of conflicting desire and the cramping fetters of inveterate self-love. If these things are so, it might be asked, why should a Christian ever be defeated in spiritual conflict? The answer is that there is no question concerning the amplitude of spiritual resource, but Christians fail to realize their privileges. Of what use is it that all provision is made for a great campaign —ammunition, arms, accoutrements, down to the last button on the soldiers' uniform—all the plans of a Von Moltke skilfully elaborated, so that it is clear that the enemy has been outwitted, outnumbered, out-generalled, if all the time the rank and file of the army are discouraged, supine, inert, or half sympathize with the enemy? 'If we live by the Spirit,' runs the timely apostolic counsel, 'by the Spirit also let us walk.' Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has set you free: stand fast first, and then go forward. So victory shall be realized here and now in a bloodless war, and perfect triumph be reached at last—

The ultimate, angels' law
Indulging every instinct of the soul
There where law, life, joy, impulse are one thing.[1]

[1] W. T. Davison, *The Indwelling Spirit*, 122.

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Harvest Thanksgiving.
The Thankful Spirit.

'In everything giv thanks.'—1 Th 5^{18}.

A hard saying to some of us, who think that some leav shou'd be left for complaining. How can a man giv thanks honestly, when, for example, some heavy blo has fall'n upon him? In spite of the example of Job: in spite of his great words, 'The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away: Blessed be the name of the Lord': in spite of this many a man wil say, 'No, it is too much to call on me to giv thanks: the thing cannot be done; and I must not make a pretence of doing it.'

We must take this objection seriously, for we kno that God wil not bear with hypocrisy. Let us remember too that St. Paul himself said, 'The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.' The precept, 'In everything giv thanks,' must be spiritually understood.

But now it is needful to be honest all round. To say that a passage of the Bible must be interpreted 'spiritually,' does not mean that we may giv it any explanation which seems to us sensible and religious-sounding, nor may we feel that we hav said 'Good-bye' to the 'letter' of the passage. The 'letter' is to be retained to be our help in reaching the 'spirit.' Just as the clothes of a man ar not the man himself, but yet can tel us a good deal about the man, so that often we recognize him by his clothes, so the letter—the actual words—of any text wil supply the key to the inner meaning of the passage. If St. Paul says, 'In everything giv thanks,' we must not simply leav out the words 'in everything'; we must not say that the spirit of the text is just 'be thankful'—'sometimes'; we must face the words and ask, 'What did St. Paul really mean by so strong an expression as "In everything giv thanks"?'

St. Paul does not content himself with saying, 'Be thankful to God for your blessings, when your blessings come.' He means 'Let thankfulness be a permanent element in your life.' In truth it is not enuf to say to us, 'Be thankful for your blessings,' for we do not see far enuf to recognize all our blessings as they come. As those of us who ar older look bak over life, we see many gifts of the Hevenly Father for which we felt no gratitude when we receiv'd them. God sent us experiences that were ruf, disappointments that were bitter, losses which it seem'd cou'd never be repaired. And yet now, counting up loss and gain, and tracing the thred of Providence thru all the years, we see that our

Father was blessing us even in those experiences. Reflection teaches so much now, but Faith wou'd hav taught us years ago and saved us many bitter hours, had we but cherisht Faith. Certainly in this St. Paul is our example. We remember how at Philippi his hopeful work was suddenly interrupted, and he and Silas were cast into prison. Hardly matter to giv thanks for, we shou'd say; but it is written, 'About midnight Paul and Silas were praying and singing hymns unto God.' And again, when the Apostle at last arrived in the neighbourhood of Rome, a prisoner in a far land to be tried for his life, it is written, 'He thanked God and took courage.'

This exiled prisoner thanked God! Why? Only because a few fellow-Christians, persons of no consequence, who cou'd do litl for him, had come to meet him in Rome. But he saw the Hand of God. Does not this incident, coupled with his previous conduct at Philippi, sho us exactly what St. Paul ment, when he wrote to the Thessalonians, 'In everything giv thanks'?

Of course there was Faith and a good understanding of the ways of God behind the Apostle's teaching. He was stedied by a great experience, by the recollection of the fact which he described in the words, 'God was pleas'd to reveal his Son in me.' He remembered how God had converted him on the road to Damascus. That tremendous experience had assured him for ever that God is good; and so he faced life in faith, and was fully convinced that the other main experiences of life were likewise controled by God and were good. So he was redy not merely to giv the Hevenly Father occasional thanks, but also to use and maintain a thankful spirit thru the whole of life. We, as Christians, ought to aim at going as far as St. Paul. We shou'd set ourselves to liv a life of thanksgiving in which we ar redy to recognize all God's fatherly lovingkindness.

No harvest thanksgiving shou'd be merely a giving thanks for harvest. We hav to thank God not because He comes into our life once a year in September or October and givs us stores of food: we owe Him thanks rather because He is our life from the beginning of the year to the end. This is one of the lessons which life itself teaches us: few of us can lern it thoro'ly while we ar young. But as life develops befor us we discover two great facts: (1) that events which seem'd once to be all against us turn out in the long run to be tru gifts of God, helps for further stages of life: (2) that blos which we dred in advance ar soften'd when they fall by the hands of God's good angels.

And so we come bak to St. Paul's noble exhortation so full of faith: 'In everything giv thanks.' Let the whole attitude of our mind and heart be thankful! It is in fact the only true attitude, the only attitude which corresponds with the ultimate facts of this world. The present awful facts of a world which cannot properly recover from the War ar after all not permanent. They pale befor the Vision which the Son of God has givn us; they cannot hold us, as we look for the Resurrection of the Dead and the Life of the World to come. Yes, tho' the War did its work and the Flood of calamity overtook us and has not yet abated, we kno that the Lord sitteth above the water Flood, bringing order again and a New World; and so, even now, we giv thanks to the Father thru Our Lord Jesus Christ, not for one particular blessing or for two, but for His love and care, which do not pass away, but continu with us thru all the changes and chances of this mortal life.[1]

Fifteenth Sunday after Trinity.

Son and Heir!

'Thou art no longer a bondservant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir through God.'—Gal 4[7] (R.V.).

'Son' and 'heir'! So that is how our position and prospects are described! Would the world recognize our status when it looks upon us? Is there anything kingly or queenly about our very walk and conversation? If we have the consciousness of sons and heirs, that consciousness will get into our faces, on to our lips, into our courtesies, into our handgrips, and there will be royal significance in all the issues of our life. But perhaps the consciousness is not present and regnant in our lives. Perhaps we are Christians who have not yet claimed or even recognized our kingdom. Perhaps we are moving about in depression and poverty, and our vast inheritance lies untrodden and unexplored. Perhaps we are hugging the title-deeds, and we have never realized the unspeakable value of our land. Perhaps we have sat down on the inside of the gate, like a waiting slave, and we are not striding over the estate like the 'son and heir.' 'Thou art no longer a bondservant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir!' To some it has been said, in words of awful disillusionment, 'Thou knowest not that thou art poor!' To others there may be equal need of the awaking and inspiring evangel, 'Thou knowest not that thou art rich!' 'Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where

[1] W. Emery Barnes, in *Twenty Harvest Homilies*, 86. (Older forms of spelling adopted by Dr. Barnes.)

thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: for all the land which thou seest to thee will I give it. . . . Arise, walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee.' Thou art the son and heir.

1. Where does our impoverishment begin? Perhaps it begins in an imperfect sense of sonship, which leads to an imperfect realization of our inheritance. Let the one be starved, and the other will be impoverished. Exalt the one, and we shall enlarge the other. What do we think, then, of sonship? What are its primary characteristics?

(1) We shall begin with *Reverence*. That may appear to be a very grey element, but it is the groundwork of all the rest. There can be no true sonship when there is flippancy at the core of the life. At the very centre of the life there must be a little chapel, serene and untroubled, where the wings are quietly folded and the soul is prostrate in ceaseless adoration. In the great chapter which tells the story of a prophet's call and ordination, the seraphim are described as creatures with six wings; 'with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly.' We can claim kinship with the seraphim in that we are in possession of the pair of wings with which to fly! Never were Christian people more busy in flying about than they are to-day! But can we claim kinship with the seraphim in respect to the other wings? It seems we are gravely lacking in those folded wings which suggest an amazed sense of the Highest, and which betoken reverence, awe, silence, and reserve. Reverence never hinders service—it enriches and perfects it. Perhaps if we had the folding, covering wings, our very flying would have more serviceable results.

Henry Drummond once went out alone into the high Alps. He was there in the early morning. The stupendous heights encompassed him on every side. He was awed by their majesty. His soul was bowed in reverent worship. And, then, what happened? He broke out into loud and exuberant laughter! The succession was not accidental, it was the fruit of a hidden root. The man who begins with the reverent recognition of the holiness and majesty of God will rise into a buoyancy of spirit in which all the merry-making powers will have free course to be glorified. Our Lord's Prayer teaches us that before we can pass into the gracious liberty of forgiveness and conquest, we must begin with the awed and reverent stoop: 'Our Father, which art in heaven, *hallowed be Thy name*.' In the heart of a laughing, exuberant, and healthy sonship there is a quiet and retired retreat where the incense of adoration rises both night and day.

(2) Surely one of the primary elements in sonship is the *privilege of intimate communion with the Father*. And is it not the wonderful heritage described to us by Jesus Christ our Saviour, 'No longer do I call you servants but friends, for all things that I have heard from my Father I have made known unto you'? Such is the rare and secret intimacy to which we are invited by our Lord. Have we seized upon this privilege of sonship?

Has not the biography of Mr. Gladstone revealed to us that he had a way of sharing the intimate secrets of his life with the Lord? He had 'a word with his Father' before he rose to speak in the House of Commons. He entered into the secret place before he appeared to the public eye. He consulted with the Almighty before he formed his Cabinets. Such constant communion soon deepens into a wonderful intimacy. The restricting reserve passes out of the life. The unnecessary shyness wears away. The soul and the Father are one.

(3) And so we may regard it as a very prominent characteristic of sonship that it is endowed with large and wealthy liberty. But sonship is not only distinguished by liberty of communion in the secret place, but by an *emancipation from many kinds of bondage* and restriction with which the world is burdened and oppressed. Sonship is conspicuously and radiantly free. The sons of God ought to fascinate and win the world by the range and grandeur of their freedom. The real son is free from the bondage of sin. His life is delivered from the haunting wail of sunless and hopeless dejection. The real son is free from the tyranny of self. He is not imprisoned by a small, exclusive, all-absorbing, egoistic, enslaving self. He has 'a heart at leisure from itself to soothe and sympathize.' The real son is free from the enslavement of the crowd. He is not daunted by the presence of the great and threatening multitude. God's sons are free and bold, and stand alone!

> They are slaves who dare not be
> In the right with two or three.

Slaves indeed! 'But now thou art no longer a bondservant, but a son,' and because a son thou art free to defy the crowd and be alone! One with God is in the majority. And the real son is free from the fear of death. His life moves on, not to expected defeat, but to ultimate triumph. The approaching shadow does not mark a terminus, but a point of transition into the larger and immortal life.

2. 'And if a son, then an heir.' The coming to God is the regaining of our estate. And our estates are not all beyond the river we call death. That is where we make an impoverishing mistake. We are not only heirs of 'great expectations,' but of great possessions. Superlatively rich are our expectations, but we have more than a competency by the way. Devonshire is a peculiarly rich and fruitful county, but it overflows into Somersetshire, and we are in the enjoyment of some of the glory before we reach the coveted spot. And so it is of heaven and ultimate glory.

There is a land of pure delight,
Where saints immortal reign;
Infinite day excludes the night,
And pleasures banish pain.

But the glory overflows! There is something of the coveted country even in the highway of time.

The hill of Zion yields
A thousand sacred sweets,
Before we reach the heavenly fields
Or walk the golden streets.

Are we in possession of the estate? 'Having nothing,' we may yet 'possess all things'! How is it, for instance, with the night sky? Have we any sense of sonship as we gaze upon it, and do we regard it as a part of our inheritance? When we contemplate some spacious panorama from an Alpine height, or from the hills of our own neighbourhood, do we thrill in the joy of possession, in the privileged sharing in the sonship of our God?

And here is another portion of our estate. Let us listen, as Paul in one sentence defines it. 'Ye are my joy and crown.' Where was he gathering those delights? He had found them in other people's well-being, in the triumph of his fellow-men. He had discovered the well of unpolluted joy in another man's success. Have we found it?

Let us lift the thought still higher. Let us lift our heirship up into the light of the burning bliss. We are 'heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ!' That is wonderful and overwhelming! We are heirs to the Lord's inheritance; His possessions are ours; we may sit with Him in the heavenly places. We may inherit His strength, His joy, His peace, His triumph. We are joint-heirs with Him in all the spiritual satisfactions that came to Him as He dwelt in the ways of men. And what did He inherit in the land of glory? 'Nor pen, nor tongue can tell.' 'Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.'[1]

Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity.

Intellect and Faith.

'When I thought to know this, it was too painful for me; until I went into the sanctuary of God.'—Ps $73^{16.17}$.

The poet is here concerned with a problem which only emerged at a relatively late period in the history of Israel. The difficulty of believing in God's righteous government of the world, in face of the apparent prosperity of the wicked man and the adversity of the good man, seems not to have pressed itself upon men's minds with any special cogency, until a severe crisis in the national life had made separation between class and class, and tested Jehovah's servants in the glowing furnace of affliction.

In the early and middle days of the Judæan monarchy, when the power of the nation was at its zenith, and men enjoyed, upon the whole, happy and prosperous times, it was the commonly received theory that in this life Jehovah rewarded the righteous and punished the wicked; prosperity was regarded as an immediate mark of His favour; adversity—especially if sudden and overwhelming—as a sure sign of His displeasure.

But the period of decadence which preceded the fall of the kingdom of Judah was marked by grave, social abuses and growing indifference to the spirit of Jehovah's religion, coupled with bare formalism or the definite introduction of foreign cults. Upright and pious men formed a despised, if not a persecuted, minority; justice and virtue seemed to bring, not success, but loss and failure in their train.

And during the Babylonian Exile this condition of things appears rather to have been accentuated than diminished.

Nor was the return from Babylon by any means a restoration of happy and prosperous times for this faithful remnant. Though those who availed themselves of the decree of Cyrus belonged, in the main, to the body who held by the hope of Israel, and were, as a whole, animated by a common aim, yet the hardships to be contended with were enormous. It was in times such as these that men turned to review their ancient position, and to perceive its partiality and insufficiency. Righteousness certainly no longer appeared uniformly to bring its reward, nor wickedness its due punishment. We must recollect that at that stage of

[1] J. H. Jowett, *The Transfigured Church*, 73.

thought quick returns were looked for. The view that righteousness would be rewarded after death, and that present hardship might form a training for a future state, so far from being generally held, was, in fact, the outcome of thought which appeared *later on* as part of the answer to the difficulties which the anomalies of the present life excited in men's minds.

The mind of the writer of our psalm was seriously exercised and, for the time being, the position of his faith was critical.

> But as for me, my feet were almost gone ;
> My steps had well-nigh slipped,
> For I was envious at the arrogant,
> When I saw the prosperity of the wicked.

But even in his misery it comes upon him that this is not the attitude which a member of the true Israel ought to adopt.

> If I had said, I will speak thus ;
> Behold, I had dealt treacherously with the generation of thy children.

Therefore, when faith seems weakest, he determines to make the severest trial of faith. He takes his difficulty into the sanctuary of God. And it is here that a solution offers itself to his mind, and he meets with perfect satisfaction.

> When I thought how I might know this,
> It was too painful for me ;
> Until I went into the sanctuary of God,
> And considered their latter end.

Let us glance for a moment at the Psalmist's explanation. It is briefly this. The prosperity of the ungodly is, after all, more apparent than real. There is a Nemesis who is waiting in their path. Even while they stretch out their eager hands to gather life's flowers, the solid rock gives way beneath their feet, and they go down quick into the abyss.

Now it must be observed that this solution is not in any sense final and altogether satisfactory. It represents a small advance in thought upon the old opinion ; but is in fact merely a partial and fragmentary contribution to the truth, and was destined soon to be merged in a larger view of God's dealings with men.

But this is not the Psalmist's real gain during his visit to the sanctuary. We find it rather in that conviction which seizes him of the great reality of his communion with God—a conviction which calls forth from him such a confession of trust in God as forms, when we consider his partial light and uncertain knowledge of the future life, a passage as remarkable and splendid as anything in the pages of the Old Testament.

> Nevertheless I am continually with thee :
> Thou hast holden my right hand.
> Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel,
> And afterward receive me to glory.
> Whom have I in heaven but thee ?
> And there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee.
> My flesh and my heart faileth :
> But God is the strength of my heart and my portion for ever.

It has been much questioned whether the Psalmist is here formulating any definite statement of belief in a life of blessedness beyond the grave. This does not seem to be precisely the position which he takes. Rather, in the fullness of the sense of his communion with Jehovah, he ignores or overlooks the fact of death ; feeling that he possesses all he needs, and that, in any event, he is entirely in the hands, and under the special care, of his God.

There are two other positions which the Psalmist might conceivably have taken up. He might have argued that the question was dangerous, as striking at the foundations of belief, and so have determined to preserve his faith by ignoring it. Or, on the other hand, he might have reasoned that, until such a difficulty had been set at rest, belief reposed upon too precarious a basis, and that it was better therefore to suspend his judgment, together with the worship of a God whose dealings with mankind were so mysterious and obscure.

He did neither. Rather, while maintaining and exercising his right to rational investigation of the question which harassed his mind, in the light of the facts which lay to his hand, he trusted that beyond this there was something *supernatural* which God alone was able to grant in response to an act of faith ; and that this latter, so far from being antagonistic to the results obtained by the exercise of reason, was indeed intended to condition and to set them in a right direction.

And so he betook himself to the place where God's mysterious Presence was believed specially to be manifest, and staking all upon an act of faith, he obtained, not merely a rational solution of his difficulty, but, what was of far higher value, such an inward sense of Jehovah's Fatherly care and protection as secured him for ever in his faith, and endued him with perfect peace.

And this is surely the way in which we ought to

meet the doubts and difficulties which so frequently assail us. We are not likely to place them on one side and to ignore them, but we must feel bound to subject them to the searching light which the advancement of knowledge has placed within our reach. Rightly so. But let us not forget that we are members of a Church which believes in and proclaims the supernatural Presence of her Lord in her midst, and that He has promised to give *Himself* to those who seek Him, in order that He may guide them into all truth. And let us be willing at least to *make trial* of the act of faith, coming to Him that we may cast our burdens upon Him, and receive for ourselves out of His fullness.

Not alone the Hebrew poet, but ten thousand others in all ages, will assure us that we shall not be disappointed; for these all have sought God in His sanctuary, and have set to their seal that He is true.[1]

[1] C. F. Burney, *The Gospel in the Old Testament*, 207.

The Holy Spirit in the Individual.

By the Reverend A. H. McNeile, D.D., Dublin.

Many Christians can state from living experience what the Holy Spirit has done in their hearts. And this kind of knowledge of Him is such that nothing can equal it in value. No article in a periodical is needed to teach it to them. But it suggests problems which are worth discussing. If (as all will admit) His activity was seen in the inspiration of good-minded Israelites, the prophets for instance, and if (as most will admit) it is seen in good-minded pagans to-day who are serving God, as they believe Him to be, to the best of their lights, what do we mean when we say that the Holy Spirit *came*, as a new experience at Pentecost? Again, if it were asked of those who have steadily advanced in holiness of life, Is it the Holy Spirit that has done this, or the indwelling Christ? many would find an answer difficult.

A preface is needed dealing with the work of the Holy Spirit in the evolution of the individual. God's eternal purpose, as St. Paul calls it, was to produce creatures akin to Himself who would perfectly love Him. But love must be voluntary; it must be free, or it is not love. Therefore, for the fulfilment of His purpose, He had to create conditions out of which man could *win* freedom. To create him free would have been to force him to be free, which is a contradiction in terms. Man must win freedom freely, which means that he can refuse to be free if he chooses. But he can win it only because God, for the fulfilment of His purpose, puts Himself, His Spirit, into the world, as a carver throws himself into the block of marble of which he purposes to make a statue. The carver's idea or purpose is, in himself, complete, but in the statue it is, so to speak, imprisoned, and wants to emerge and win its true self as the statue progresses from the block. To put it more technically, the Spirit of God is purely immanent in inanimate matter, and becomes less and less so as the process goes on. In life, and then in mind, His work is seen at a continuously higher level; and the process culminated in man. This growing freedom is such that man, and no lower life, has reached the power of voluntarily placing himself in union with God. That is the work of man's free will, but it is equally the work of the Divine Spirit emerging from immanence. When *all* men are *wholly* in union with God, His eternal purpose will be accomplished.

Now look at man's religion. At the first emergence of mind at the human level of self-consciousness, man's power of voluntary union with God was very small indeed. From a stage, probably, even lower than animism he slowly rose, through fetichism and totemism, to polydæmonism and Nature-worship. And then in the Semitic branch of the human family a special line of advance was seen. They conceived, first, the idea of monolatry; and then that of pure monotheism. Led by the inspired teachers whom we call the prophets, Israel became convinced that only one God in heaven or earth was possible or conceivable. The comparative study of religions is the thrilling continuation of the study of biology. The immanent Spirit was coming more and more into freedom as man drew nearer and nearer into voluntary union with God. It is impossible to say, very often, in biology why particular lines of descent strike out new features, except that it is according to God's method of furthering the general advance. And the only explanation of the great moral and spiritual

superiority of Israel over other nations is the same. Revelation, a message from outside, was imparted through the indwelling Spirit. As God (in Himself far removed from any limitations, as the artist's mind is independent of the block in which his thought is taking shape) is voluntarily 'imprisoned' in immanence within the sphere of space and time, so Revelation necessarily takes the form of Discovery. The former is from the point of view of man as distinct from God; the latter from the point of view of man as indwelt by God. Races other than Israel, in their spiritual evolution, as species often do in biological evolution, underwent variations which failed to reach so high a point.

It is thus possible to recognize the Holy Spirit's work in all religions, but acting on different levels of spiritual attainment, as He does at different levels of life.

But when we have arrived in our survey at the Hebrew prophets, we are still infinitely below the perfect union with God, the perfect freedom and transcendence of His Spirit and of ours, which is His final purpose. The advance to full stature for which man is destined was rendered quite impossible by the presence of sin. When, in his evolution, he had attained to a certain level, sin became possible, and it entered like a poison pervading the system. The power to sin belonged to a certain stage of growth, when man emerged from the beast; but the power to reach the uttermost stage of maturity was thereby annulled. God would have been disappointed of His hope, His purpose would have been frustrated had He not performed an action which was outside the process. Man's freedom from the bonds of space and time, from division within himself, from the down-dragging force of the natural man which is in opposition to freedom—this can never be more than partial along the lines of the immanent Spirit's work in evolution. But the transcendent God took manhood, in the person of one Man, into perfect union with Himself. That is to say, one Man, at a bound, stood at the goal of the process; He was perfectly free. And so mankind, as a living whole, was not at a helpless standstill as he had been before; he now possessed a potentiality, which universal sin had previously barred, of becoming perfectly free, as he was ideally already in the perfect Man. But since man still lives in time and space, this must be reached by process; the object of Christianity, which is the final object of God, is the actualizing for each individual of the freedom of Christ. We are to reach in very fact the ideal of standing fast in the freedom wherewith Christ hath made us free.

As soon as that potentiality was made available for man, a new level of the Spirit's work was reached. And Pentecost was His first impact upon the Church, the men who were united with Christ in His new freedom. The perfection, the transcendent life, of the Man Christ Jesus, completely attained through death, was, by the heavenly existence into which death was the entry, made available for all men. The heavenly Christ, by passing through death and resurrection, supplied that life to the human race; and the immanent Spirit could now enable any man who willed to make that life his own.

Now we are in a position to sum up the answers to the questions with which we started. How can we say that the Holy Spirit came at Pentecost when He has been at work in all men and all things since the world began? He has been, and still is, at work on different levels. He works in matter as the Energy which unceasingly causes it to exist; in the life of the body, in progressive degrees as life rises higher in the scale; in mind, again on a rising scale till man is reached. Here are three successive levels. But then comes higher work:

> All tended to mankind;
> And man produced, all hath an end so far;
> But in completed man begins anew
> A tendency to God.

The work of the same Holy Spirit is seen in the development and purification of religion. The rising scale is as evident as ever. The fullest inspiration of a Hebrew Prophet or Psalmist is higher than that of the greatest exponent of any other religion except Christianity, although in all cases it is the work of 'the same Spirit.' But though the Hebrew John the Baptist was the greatest of those born of women, yet he that is least in the Kingdom of God is greater than he. This does not mean that the poorest beginner in the Christian life is a holier man than John, but that he has more possibilities than John; the best Jew could never develop to the height that the best Christian can reach. Because of the Incarnation of Christ, the Holy Spirit could begin His work at a yet higher—much higher—level, because the end which He could reach was 'a perfect man, the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.' From the creation of the atom till the climax of the growth of the new creation the whole is an unceasing process, in which the Spirit of God and the spirit of man alike, in the oneness of co-operation, move towards freedom, that is to say, move from immanence towards transcendence.

And the second question. The highest life of the soul—from whence is it, from Christ or from the

Holy Spirit? It is from both, and must be from both; but their functions are different. The Holy Spirit supplies the Divine motive power, the Divine urge, which co-operates with our will, so that we perpetually deepen in us the Divine life of Christ. Christ is the Truth; the Holy Spirit is the Divine Teacher who takes of the things of Christ and shows them to us. Christ is the Divine atmosphere in which the Christian lives who has passed from death unto life; the Holy Spirit is his breath, his inspiration. Christ is our food; the Holy Spirit is the Divine activity of life in us which enables us to assimilate it, so that it becomes part of us. St. Paul speaks both of the Communion of the Body, and the Blood, of Christ, and the Communion (Fellowship) of the Holy Spirit; the latter is the power by which we get the former. Christ is 'our life'; 'Christ in you' is 'the hope of glory,' the hope of reaching actually and perfectly the Divine condition that is potentially ours already; the Holy Spirit is the kinetic energy by which we progress towards it, if we voluntarily 'live in the Spirit,' and 'walk in the Spirit,' and are 'led by the Spirit.' Christ is our Righteousness, our Salvation, our Mediator; His work is done, and we are 'in Him,' sharing (potentially) in all that He has done and in all that He is; the Holy Spirit is our Sanctification, He who, by co-operation with our will, carries on the process of making us actually as individuals what Christ has made us potentially as one whole.

But we must remember that these Divine Persons are a Unity. When we pray, it is not to the Father or the Son or the Holy Spirit *as such*. We pray to *God*, that we may be enabled to do this and that, in order, by the power of the Holy Spirit, to grow more deeply into Christ, and to come unto the Father by Him.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Historical and Supra-Historical Religion.

One of the fundamental problems of philosophy is the relation of time to eternity; an urgent question for religion is: has time any reality, even if relative, for the eternal God? If time be but the negation of eternity, and has no reality for God Himself, then human history has no significance and value for God, and man deceives himself if in his religion he assumes that he has a relation to God, which means something, and has some worth for God as well as for himself. Unduly influenced by Greek speculative philosophy, Christian theology in the past often failed to do justice to the Christian revelation and redemption in its Godward aspect. Full justice can be done to it only if human history has significance and value for God, because time has reality.

It is a basic question with which Dr. Dibelius sets himself to deal in this work,[1] *Historical and Supra-Historical Religion in Christianity*, of the contents of which a brief account is here attempted. His first chapter is entitled *Time*. His object being to deal with Christianity in its historical appearance and supra-historical meaning, he first of all discusses the present age as an age of transition, and refers to three movements in Germany, as signs of the times, the *youth-movement*, *expressionism*, and *irrationalism*; but interesting as his account of these is, it must be passed over. The theological situation in this age of transition is described in the words: 'The traditional faith in the "God of history" appears shaken thoroughly, and the historical conditionalness of the Christian origins seems to overshadow the eternal. From two sides the question presses, how the historical and the supra-historical life in Christianity, that is, however, in its classical period, are related' (p. 15). The second chapter discusses *Religion*. Its problem is stated in the words: 'With revelation what is above the world breaks into the existence of the world; with the diffusion of the revelation, its witness, original declaration, and propaganda for it, that bit of what is above the world becomes embedded in the world. A world-religion arises first of all by combining both, *the push, which works into the depth, and the power which works in the breadth*' (p. 23). The historian must make manifest both what is essential in the primitive Christian possession, and also how even that was conditioned by the world and the age. But as

[1] *Geschichtliche und übergeschichtliche Religion im Christentum*, von Martin Dibelius (Göttingen: Vanderhoek & Ruprecht, 1925).

Christianity has developed, this double quest has to be pursued throughout its history. We come accordingly in the third chapter to *the Gospel.* Here the author accepts the critical position, that Jesus' preaching of the Kingdom was in character eschatological. He admits that this conclusion involves that His conception was bound up with a superseded world-view, and that the consequent expectation of a near cosmic catastrophe was mistaken. He maintains, however, that in this way the faith of Jesus in the End (*Endglaube*), the crisis of human history, was neither made void nor disposed of as unessential. Only 'the faith in the End explains why Jesus appeared just at this moment, and why He so appeared, and so spake, as He did. The Gospel experiences an *actual sharpening* from which the Jewish hope was still far removed. But the actualization refers only to the motive, not the goal. For what Jesus brings is more than a word conditioned by time, or a deed conditioned by the world. The belief in the End exactly gives the Key into the hand to interpret word and deed aright. In the framework of the belief in the End, what is most bound by time appears in the atmosphere of the eternal, and that most current in the world on the background of a great distance from the world. *The elevation into the unconditioned* is beside that actual sharpening the second moment, through which the faith in the end characterizes the message of Jesus over against other doctrines, philosophies, and wisdoms' (p. 41). This sharpening is personal as well as actual. 'The man who in this most critical moment not only brings the message before men, but is sent among men, bears not only with His word, but with His person, responsibility for this cosmic hour.' For 'not *what Jesus says and does* is the principal thing, but *what He means in regard to the Kingdom* of God.' It is only in this way that 'the faith in the end leads to the Gospel its *exaltation into the unconditioned*' (p. 44). In Him the eternal touches the temporal, the supra-historical is expressed in the historical. Hence '*the commands for human conduct*—no more to be carried through in the old world, not needed in the new—*describe only a human attitude*; what looks like purposeful *ethics* is unconditional *ethics*—a new being in view of the Kingdom, in the unconditioned atmosphere of eternity, in the nearness of the God entering the world' (p. 45). 'These words and deeds are themselves historically conditioned, and demand a historical investigation.' Nevertheless all is 'only description of a being exalted above time' (p. 46). What we have in the Gospel is not dependent on eschatology; what is characteristic is '*the juxtaposition of the human soul, the human life, the human destiny and the reality of God, the measuring of all human things by His measure, the judgment of time by eternity*' (p. 65). The contrast between this supra-historical and the historical attitude is shown by the change in the Lord's Prayer from its original form in Luke to its developed form in Matthew. In Luke 'it is the prayer of the new existence in nearness to God, the existence that has come into the world with Jesus.' In Matthew, 'it is the prayer of a pious worshipping community, of a religion in the sociological meaning, as Christians form it' (p. 69).

The fourth chapter, under the title *Christ,* deals with two developments: '*the expansion of the relation of discipleship,* which even in the lifetime of Jesus allows disciples to become believers, and *the alteration of the faith in the Kingdom into the Easter faith by the death of Jesus*' (p. 73). Out of this Easter faith grew the faith in Christ. Even when the expectations of the coming of the Kingdom were disappointed, 'this reality of a world, in which by faith they participated, was far too strong in them to be destroyed with a disillusionised expectation. On the contrary, the certainty of this world of their faith brought it to their consciousness, that the events, which were the conditions of their salvation, were not first about to be, but had already been; that they had not, conscious of their completed salvation, to waste themselves in longings for it, but had to live as citizens of the already revealed new world even under the outward conditions of the old Aeon. And the world that surrounded them offered them the representations in which this consciousness could take form; the *Christ-myth*' (p. 82). With this Christ-myth was associated the *Christ-cultus,* and 'both were transformed in the thought of Christian theology in the doctrine of the *Christ-dogma*' (p. 85). 'Theology springs from a threefold need of the believing man: he wishes to express the content of his faith, he wishes to give it a basis, he wishes to weave it into the whole of his life' (p. 86). It may be questioned, however, whether the inexpressible, the Divine world, to which religion is related, can be so expressed and demonstrated. Kant's theory of knowledge has strengthened our sense of the limits of religious knowledge. Two courses are open: the psychological, the description of religious experience, as by Schleiermacher, or the symbolical, as by Kierkegaard. 'The Christ-dogma (of the Church) is not the fulfilment, but rather the destruction of the

mystery indicated in the Christ-myth' (p. 91); and this controversy illustrates the polarity of the historical, the full manhood of Jesus, and the supra-historical, the full godhead of Christ, at least as the Greeks understood it. The Reformation failed to concentrate on the description of the good of salvation; but Luther took up the old Christology in its most temporally conditioned philosophical form, and consequently Protestantism at its beginning lost its dogmatic unity, and became ever more divided. The fault lies not in the mode of formulation, but in the attempt to formulate at all, as faith in Christ is a stronger bond than any dogma about Christ can be; and freedom of inquiry depends on asserting the independence of the possession of faith on the changeable theological results. By the development described in this chapter Christianity entered into the *world*; with this the fifth chapter deals. It is not so important to estimate how much non-Christian material was taken up into Christianity in this process of finding a home in the world, as the fact itself, 'that the world-avoiding community of Christians found its way into the world, and in this manner first became religion in the sociological sense' (p. 112). *The Church*, with which chapter six deals, also belongs to the world. While claiming holiness for the organism the Catholic Church makes a cosmic claim; a holy circle in the world it claims to expand till it embraces the world. Roman Catholicism advances along this path; Greek adheres to the past; Protestantism is a reaction, a return to primitive Christianity, to emphasis on 'the religious character of the community and the religious values which become alive in it' (p. 120). The Protestant believes in a holy invisibility of the Church, but the Church, as he sees it, is *world*, 'never the last word, as it is a historical appearance, but piety is concerned with supra-historical values' (p. 123). These values he is sure of only in personal faith, and not in the society historically conditioned as it is, and must be, for he is ever protesting against the confusion of God and the world. In the policy of the Church in Germany this principle was not consistently carried out, and a bad copy of Catholicism has been attempted. Both types of Christianity, the secular and the non-secular, exist by right. The non-secular may be prophetic or sectarian; the secular may be critical or optimistic. The prophetic and the critical have much in common; the sectarian and optimistic, least. Into the detailed discussion of practical problems in German church life it is not necessary now to enter.

Chapter seven aims at showing how also *ethics* is *world*. In its history the Christian Church had to provide moral guidance for life in the world. '*Christian ethics* was formed, not in a fundamental renovation, but *gradually, case by case*, and partly *with borrowed materials*' (p. 148). This ethics was, however, an ethics of this age and of this world. We must not blame this process as a fault but acknowledge it as a fate. The failure to gain an independent ethics new born out of the Christian spirit is most manifest in regard to sexual and social questions. In regard to these there is constant need to create anew out of the new life in Christ a new morality to meet the changing conditions. '*It is in fact possible, from the motives of the Christian message, to reach diametrically opposed conduct in the world*' (p. 163). Only as regards motive can we speak of a Christian social message; this is concerned with '*the sentiment of love*, the high valuation of *spiritual life*, and the consciousness of *divine favour*' (p. 164); but as the conduct to which this motive leads must be in the world, even Christian ethics belongs to the world.

Chapter eight deals with the problem that confronts mankind to-day, *the problem of destiny*. This problem cannot be solved theoretically, but only practically. The Christian must be in the world, but not of the world. The task of Christianity is to make a world in which the eternal reality is manifest, and is made anew in all changes of time. 'The Knowledge, that even its classical time was historically conditioned through and through, can only lighten this solution. For already the historical course of the primitive Christian age most urgently preaches the necessity of Christianity becoming the world. We do not know how far it is appointed to our generation to translate the supra-historical power of the Christian message anew into historical life. But the power is available, and it lies with us, to let it work' (p. 173).

It has been impossible in this summary to do justice to the wealth of valuable material this small volume contains, as the aim has been to indicate the development of the argument. The treatment is lucid, progressive, and comprehensive; and the leading idea—this contrast between the historical and the supra-historical in Christianity—is skilfully used as a clue through the labyrinth of the past developments and present problems of the Church. It is a volume which can be heartily commended.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

Spiritual Power in Later Judaism and in the New Testament.[1]

By the Reverend Campbell N. Moody, M.A., Missionary in Formosa.

The literature of the Apocrypha and other products of later Judaism is tedious and unspiritual, and yet not wanting in expressions of dependence upon God in matters of heart and life. Earnest efforts to do His will and observe His law led, of course, in some cases, to reflections on the merits of good works, and even, as Schlatter has shown, on the merits of faith, and again, on the redemptive power of alms, prayers, and penitence. 'Our works are subject to our own choice and power,' says one; 'to do right or wrong in the works of our hands' (Ps Sol 9^{7}). 'If thou wilt,' declares another, 'thou shalt keep the commandments; and to perform faithfulness is of thine own good pleasure' (Sir 15^{15}). This, however, is a protest against a fatalism very common among Gentiles of that age; it is an affirmation of responsibility, an acquitting of God of all blame for men's misdeeds and of all unrighteousness in His judgments: the context in both cases must be remembered.

While some tried to balance good works against bad, others were fain to acknowledge sin. In books written after the great Return, such as Ezra, Daniel, and Baruch, the confessions of national unworthiness are very strong, and it is astonishing to read in 2 Mac that the sufferers in the midst of their persecutions charge both their people and themselves with sin. Even in 4 Mac there is no trace of the thought that Israel is an innocent, suffering servant. What many of the later books expect is that God Himself will abolish evil. We need not dwell upon such predictions; they are to be found in the Books of Adam and Eve, the Book of Jubilees, the Book of Enoch, the Testament of Dan, and elsewhere. Some of them suggest magical transformation rather than a gracious work of God's Spirit in the heart. Yet the later writers have not altogether forgotten the lesson of grace which Deuteronomy and the prophets taught, as may be seen from the following words: 'They shall no longer sin before His face, for the evil heart shall be taken from them, and there shall be given them a heart understanding the good, and to serve God only' (*Apoc. Mosis*, 13^{5}; cf. *Assump. Mosis*, 12^{7}).

In the present age what were men to do? As in earlier times, they were sometimes urged to make themselves righteous. 'Make your hearts good before the Lord,' says the Testament of Simeon (5^{2}); and 4 Mac (7^{16}; cf. 7^{23}) asserts that inspired Reason is able to guide the passions (cf. Wis 10^{13}). But how earnestly the Jewish elders in the Letter of Aristeas admonish the Gentile king to pray for strength! 'He must pray to God,' says one, 'that no duty may be neglected.' 'If you wish the aforesaid graces to continue,' advises another, 'you must call upon God continually' (par. 226, 245; cf. 17, 20, etc.). In 2 Mac 1^{3} there is a prayer for the Jews in Egypt that God may give them all a heart to worship Him and do His pleasure.

The Book of Jubilees gives several instances of prayer for spiritual power, as when Abraham says, 'My son Jacob, may the God of all bless thee and strengthen thee to do righteousness, and His will before Him' (22^{10}; cf. 22^{14}, 25^{15}). The Son of Sirach gives utterance to many a harsh saying, and he talks of the merits of piety and charity in a very irreligious fashion; yet when he extols the bliss of an untroubled conscience and of a life that calls for no repentance (14^{1-2}), he is aware that this is beyond common attainment. 'Who hath had the power to transgress, and hath not transgressed?' is his melancholy cry (Sir 31^{10}). And, in the midst of an unpleasant mixture of worldliness, cynicism, and mercantile piety, he breaks out into a remarkable prayer: 'Who shall set a watch over my mouth, and a seal of shrewdness upon my lips, that I fall not from it, and that my tongue destroy me not? O Lord, Father and Master of my life, abandon me not to their counsel: suffer me not to fall by them. Who will set scourges over my thought, and a discipline of wisdom over mine heart? That . . . mine ignorances be not multiplied, and my sins abound not, and I shall fall before mine adversaries, and mine enemy rejoice over me. O Lord, Father and God of my life, give me not a proud look, and turn away concupiscence from me. Let not greediness and chambering overtake me; and give me not over to a shameless mind' (*ib.* 22^{27}–23^{6}).

But this is surpassed by one of the Psalms of Solomon: 'When my soul slumbered (being afar) from the Lord, I had all but slipped down to the

[1] A preliminary article on *Spiritual Power in Pagan Religions and in the Old Testament* appeared in January.

pit. When (I was) far from God, my soul had been wellnigh poured out unto death, (I had been) nigh unto the gates of Sheol with the sinner, when my soul departed from the Lord God of Israel—Had not the Lord helped me with His everlasting mercy. He pricked me, as a horse is pricked, that I might serve Him; my saviour and helper at all times saved me. . . . Rule me, O God, (keeping me back) from wicked sin, and from every wicked woman that causeth the simple to stumble. . . . Protect my tongue and my lips with words of truth; anger and unreasoning wrath put far from me. Murmuring, and impatience in affliction, remove far from me, when, if I sin, Thou chastenest me that I may return (unto Thee). But with goodwill and cheerfulness support my soul; when Thou strengthenest my soul, what is given (to me) will be sufficient for me. For if Thou givest not strength, who can endure chastisement with poverty?' (Ps Sol 16, in Charles, *Apocr. and Pseudep.*). What an autobiography, and what a prayer!

All these prayers for righteousness and for deliverance are offered by men who love the Law. We are reminded that the 19th and 119th Psalms in the Old Testament express the same ardour for God's statutes, and that the man in whom the prophecy of Jeremiah received fulfilment when he exclaimed, 'I delight to do Thy will, O my God; yea, Thy law is within my heart,' was the same person who cried to the Lord, 'Mine iniquities have overtaken me, so that I am not able to look up; they are more than the hairs of mine head, and my heart hath failed me. Be pleased, O Lord, to deliver me' (Ps 40^{12-13}).

Of late, too many writers have ignored the truth of Paul's judgments on the Law. The Law has been, and, in a broad sense of the word, law will always be, a great teacher. It has been well said that what the prophets attempted, but failed to accomplish, the Law achieved. With the synagogue as its instrument, it instructed, not a handful of disciples, but a whole nation, in the worship of the Most High. The old prophets, however spiritual their messages might be, were never able to disregard the question, Is Jehovah the true God? With painful surprise we see that Jeremiah, who so delighted in the religion of the heart, was still at the close of his life obliged to contend with Jews and Jewesses who argued that the worship of Jehovah had proved a mistake, and that they were more prosperous when they served the Queen of Heaven (Jer $44^{17ff.}$). Now, any one who has lived in a heathen land must perceive that so long as worshippers of God are busy debating in their own minds, or even with outsiders, the rival claims of deities, it is difficult for them to get 'far ben.' When at last the Law and the lawyers took hold of the people, and swept out all leaven of paganism, there was leisure for the question, Are we serving God aright? Then men could begin to pray, 'Search me, O God, and know my heart: try me and know my thoughts. And see if there be any way of wickedness in me, and lead me in the way everlasting' (Ps 139^{23-24}).

It is a great step when men begin to inquire, What is the chief commandment? Who is my neighbour? What shall I do to inherit eternal life? It is much even to ask, How may I observe all those laws? And will God help me to observe them?

What kind of petitions were uttered in the synagogue when Jesus frequented it? In the Jewish Prayer-Book there are prayers that are thought to have been used while the Temple was yet standing. Did the fishermen of Galilee join in such words as these, 'O our Father, our King, . . . put it into our hearts to understand and to discern, to mark, learn, and teach, to heed, to do, and to fulfil in love all the words of instruction in thy Law. Enlighten our eyes in thy Law, and let our hearts cleave to thy commandments, and unite our hearts to love and fear thy name, so that we may never be put to shame'?[1]

Schlatter has shown in a very interesting way (*Der Glaube im neuen Testament*) how much discussion there was in the synagogues of Palestine, even before the advent of Christ, on the value of faith, and on the merits and rewards of Abraham's faith, and the like. This, as he remarks, was faith in God's providence, and, we may add, in His wonder-working power. It has no direct bearing, therefore, on our present subject; yet it must be mentioned here because the knowledge of the fact helps us to see how readily our Lord and His disciples might be understood when they spoke of faith.

Was prayer like that of the 119th Psalm habitual among pious Jews? Did Paul, before his conversion, appeal to God for spiritual strength? Or was it true of him and of many of his contemporaries, in a strict sense of the words, that they 'sought to establish a righteousness of their own'? No inference can be drawn from the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican.

Certain it is that after his conversion it might have been said of Paul at any time, 'Behold he prayeth!' What an extraordinary outburst there was in him and in the Church of Christ!

[1] *Jew. Prayer-Book*, p. 39, ed. by S. Singer and I. Abrahams.

The like had never been known. 'In the most emotional moments of a Roman of enlightenment, like Cicero,' says Fowler, 'when we can truly say of him that he was touched by true religious feeling . . . prayers find no place at all. But for St. Paul and the members of the early Christian brotherhood, the whole of life was a continuous worship, and the one great feature of that worship was prayer.'[1] Even thus the truth is insufficiently expressed. For Paul and for us the life which we now live is 'in Christ'; we live by faith in the Son of God. The actual prayers of the New Testament are not many; some, however, like those embedded in the Epistles to the Colossians and to the Ephesians, are very impressive. What most strikes the reader is that everywhere in Paul, Peter, John, and the Apocalypse there is a triumphant sense of dependence on God in Christ Jesus. Bousset has well observed that it is difficult for Paul to give a command because the Christian already *is* what he is urged to be. And for Paul and many a Christian since it is sometimes difficult to pray, because the heart is full of its possession.

And now, between the Old Testament and other pre-Christian writings on the one side, and the Epistles on the other, comes the life and death of Jesus. What shall we say of the records in the Synoptic Gospels? Shall we say that they differ as much from the Epistles as from the Old Testament? The Epistles are saturated with faith in Christ as the source of all spiritual strength. They show this, it is to be observed, partly by employing the words 'faith' and 'believe,' partly by other expressions such as 'in Christ,' 'through Christ,' 'have fellowship with Him,' 'know Him,' 'abide in the Son,' 'have the Son,' 'to be Christ's,' 'put on Christ,' 'call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

We observe something similar in the Gospels. The terms 'faith' and 'believe' are employed; but, for the most part, when the highest religious topics are spoken of, other modes of speech take their place. With reference to God the mention of faith or trust or belief is rare; but a good deal is said that implies profound confidence in the Heavenly Father's readiness to answer prayer, and to give food and raiment, protection and guidance, and victory over death. This accords with the trust in God's care and protection so prominent in the Old Testament; but the Gospels convey an inexpressible sense of intimacy with the Father, and of satisfaction and joy in His purpose, even when it leads to suffering and death.

What about life and conduct? Here we look for much, and we seem to find little. The prayer that Jesus taught His disciples is in most of its petitions a prayer for spiritual blessing. The suppliants ask God so to work that His name may be honoured, and His rule prevail. For themselves they entreat that their sins may be forgiven, and that they may not be led into temptation. How meagre this is to our feeling! We would fain believe that Jesus said, Your Heavenly Father will give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him. Must we choose between Matthew's version and Luke's? Or did Jesus repeat the saying many times, and vary the expression? Of His own prayers the Synoptic Gospels tell but little. In Luke's Gospel Peter receives the assurance, 'I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not.'

It is predominantly in connexion with the miracles that the words 'faith' and 'believe' are used. Jesus frequently worked miracles without depending on any one's Faith. The three Sabbath healings seem thrust upon the patients and upon the public too. The same may be said of the two Sabbath healings recorded by John. It is as if Jesus wished to throw down a challenge to Sabbath-observers, and to bear the sole responsibility of breaking the Law! It is plain from His message to John, from His command to the Gadarene demoniac, and from His vehement reproach of the cities which did not repent, although they had seen His mighty works, that Jesus set great store by His mighty works, and sometimes wished them to be known, whether as signs of the Messianic Kingdom or not, we need not now inquire. His readiness to work apart from any recipient's faith increases our surprise at His delight in the manifestation of faith. Jesus attached very great importance to faith in His own wonder-working power. Shall we speak of faith in the power of God working through Jesus? No; for, as a rule, what patients thought of was His own power; and He never disclaimed this, but on one occasion directly asked the question, Believe ye that I am able to do this? He was not alarmed, as many critics are, when allegiance was paid to Himself. When the Gadarene was sent home to tell what 'the Lord' had done for him, Mark understood 'the Lord' to mean Jesus; for at once he added that the man went home and told what Jesus had done for him (Mk 5^{20}). We are not here discussing what Greek or Aramaic word Jesus used; it is enough to observe that in two other passages Mark employed the name 'Lord' in a similar way; in the one of these it means God (Mk 13^{20}), in the other it means Jesus (Mk 11^{3}).

[1] Fowler, *Relig. Exper. of Rom. People*, 468.

But perhaps we ought to exclaim, as J. Weiss did, at the wonderful faith of Jesus Himself, when, for example, He went right on to the ruler's house, undeterred by the news that the little girl was dead. This imports a foreign element into the Gospels. Jesus, on one occasion, gave the disciples to understand that they had failed to heal an epileptic boy because of their want of faith and prayer. But the only passage in the Synoptics that even suggests prayer of His own in connexion with healing is that in which it is said that Jesus looked up to heaven and sighed (Mk 7^{34}). That He prayed and that He was obliged to exercise faith is beyond dispute. But the records give the impression that His wonder-working power was not one of the matters in which His faith was strained. However this may be, it sets the narratives awry when attention is called to Christ's faith in God, while He makes everything of faith in Himself.

When Jesus felt surprise at the absence of faith in His power among the townsmen of Nazareth, we should have been apt to exclaim, What matter? belief or disbelief of this order will not make the smallest difference in the character of the men and women concerned. But for Jesus the faith of the centurion was manifestly a great joy, and He saw in it the harbinger of untold blessings for outside nations. Probably He felt a like joy in the faith of the Syro-Phœnician woman. And, on the other hand, He showed His disgust at the faithlessness of all concerned in the plight of the epileptic boy, and His disappointment that, after so much experience of His power, the disciples did not expect Him to guard them from the storm. (Cf. what is said of the provision of loaves in connexion with the warning against 'the leaven of the Pharisees.') Did our Lord recognize, more than we do, that a higher faith is frequently, or usually, built upon a lower, and that the noblest motives grow from baser ones? Many a convert from Heathendom sets out with nothing better than the belief that God will protect and prosper him, and arrives at the most spiritual faith and the most unselfish devotion.

But now, we are ready to exclaim, if our Lord so valued faith in His miracles, how much more highly must He have esteemed the faith that could work moral miracles and save immortal souls! This kind of faith is familiar to us; and we have gained our knowledge from the New Testament. But did we learn it from the Synoptic Gospels?

We read among other matters in the Gospels that it is not enough to observe the Law in the most approved way, the way of Scribes and Pharisees; no one may enter God's kingdom unless he outruns them. To keep the Ten Commandments is not enough. If a man commits no murder, but bursts into angry speech, he is still an offender. If he keeps the seventh commandment, yet indulges a lustful look, he is an adulterer. 'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth?' Not so with you: you must treat with the utmost generosity those who insult and oppress you, and make unjust demands. 'Love your neighbour as yourself': do to him as you would have him do to you; if your brother offends you and repents, you must forgive; no matter how often he repeats his offence, you must still be ready to pardon. Is this enough? I say, Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you; give your best wishes to those who wish you the worst, and pray to God for those who hunt you down. For you must be perfect, like your Heavenly Father who loves all, both those who love and those who hate Him.

What a law! if we call it 'law.' We tremble as we picture to ourselves the boundless demands that are made upon us. With J. Weiss[1] we are fain to confess that to meet such hate with such love our own goodwill does not suffice. But does Jesus say anything of Divine allies in our extremity?

We remember His announcement that He has come to call sinners, that He is like a physician who goes to the sick, like a shepherd who goes after a lost sheep and finds it, like a father who welcomes back an erring son, nay more, that He has power to pardon sin. These sayings puzzle us, because their grace appears to have no connexion with the awful severity of the demands.

Consider again that the Epistles contain far more precepts than all the Gospels do. Not to make much of Thessalonians, Philippians, and Galatians, there are contained in the First Epistle of Peter and in Ephesians whole lists of commands. Most of all, Paul lays down in the Epistle to the Romans a long series of very exacting rules, and some of these recall the Sermon on the Mount. Neither Paul, nor any other writer, was careful to remind his readers that the injunctions could not be observed without supernatural strength. The readers were Christians who already possessed all strength because they lived by faith in Jesus Christ.

It is not much otherwise with such precepts as we have taken from our Lord's words. They are, as all critics acknowledge, but readers often forget, addressed to disciples, men who had heeded such invitations as, Come to Me, Forsake all and follow Me, Receive Me. The words of command issue

[1] *S.N.T.*, p. 280.

from the lips of One who made everything for time and eternity to depend on a close attachment to Himself.

A question arises and presses upon us: Why did Jesus, when He spoke of miracles in the physical world, make much of faith, and, when He spoke of greater things, use language quite different? The first part of the answer is obvious: in order to receive healing it was unnecessary to become a 'follower'; it was sufficient to 'believe' that Jesus was able to cure. Such 'faith' saved the sufferer; he 'saved his life' by it. For the salvation of the soul it was far otherwise: a man must 'lose his life'; the rich young man must sell all and follow Jesus to gain 'eternal life'; in general, it was necessary to put friends and kinsfolk, property, life, self, in the second place, and yield oneself to Jesus. This was faith; but it was faith of a higher order, so much higher that it claimed a different order of speech. It could not be put in a more intimate and concrete fashion than in the words, Come; Forsake and follow; Receive. When Jesus was no longer visibly present, such language ceased to be appropriate: the Church was soon obliged to speak of 'faith,' which was the best word in the circumstances, but, as every one knows, liable to be misunderstood. The misunderstanding was avoided in the phrase, 'Renounce yourself and follow Me.'

It has been necessary to discuss this matter because the subject of 'Faith,' as it is unfolded in the Gospels, has been treated by Schlatter, Bousset, and others in a mechanical fashion, just as if they had turned up the concordance for the words 'faith' and 'believe.' Denney, in his *Jesus and the Gospel*, does not correct this error.

We may sum up our discussion. The Old Testament is not so full in its recognition of spiritual need and Divine supply as the ordinary reader supposes; but it is richer in this respect than some modern writers represent, and it far excels the ancient heathen religions. We seem justified in concluding that between the return from Exile and the coming of Christ, as the demands of God's Law became better recognized, the sense of spiritual dependence increased in the minds of the most godly. Then comes, shall we say? the announcement by word and example of a new 'law,' so lofty in its requirements that enlightened Jews of the present day reject it as impossible. At the same time, *apart from what Jesus says of attachment to Himself*, nothing, or next to nothing, is said of Divine aid for its performance. Yet, when the Teacher is gone, we find Stephen, in his dying prayer, fulfilling the new law, and soon the fiery Paul learns to say, 'Being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we endure; being defamed, we entreat' (1 Co 4^{12}): 'I take pleasure in weaknesses, in injuries, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake' (2 Co 12^{10}). These men ascribe everything to Jesus. What can we conclude but that they were right, and that they fulfilled the law because they had truly learned of Him who 'came to fulfil'? Yet we are told that it was they who introduced into the gospel 'a double object of faith' (Jesus side by side with God), and thus they caused confusion. O blessed confusion!

The Parable of the Tares

(MATT. XIII. 24–30, 36–43).

By the Reverend Leslie H. Bunn, B.A., Crewkerne, Somerset.

The Parable of the Tares is followed by an explanation which our Lord gave, at their request, to His disciples. The present exposition is based on the observation that Jesus had one purpose in telling the story to the multitude, and quite another when He afterwards spoke to the disciples.

This is in accordance with His custom as a Teacher, for He always had regard to the special needs of His hearers. He sat patiently unfolding to all who cared to listen the nature of the Kingdom of Heaven, and to this end He told this story; but when His own intimate followers sought the inner meaning of His teaching He at once turned to adapt the Parable to serve their particular case. In His eyes they were men set apart for a great mission, and their preparation was His peculiar concern. For them, therefore, He takes again the allegory and turns it about to show them the truth they most need to see.

But it is not the whole of the Parable that He expounds for His disciples. It was not meant

primarily for them at its first telling, and if in His interpretation He studiously omits a part of it, perhaps that part has a closer application for others than for them. The latter half of the story (vv.[27ff.]) consists of a dialogue between the householder and his slaves, yet to this passage Jesus makes no reference whatever in His private discourse. It is true that the Parable has a unity even without these verses—a fact which our Lord uses to advantage. But this passage gives to the whole a dramatic interest which is of the highest importance in His appeal to the multitude, and because in a great Teacher method and purpose alike are deliberate, we may seek here the supreme ethical interest also.

The 'slaves of the householder' are introduced solely for the purpose of raising two questions. They are not engaged in the action of the allegory; their function is rather that of chorus, whose business it is to say certain things which the author desires to express, and which cannot be said except from the detached standpoint conventionally assumed by the chorus. Here, as so often in Greek drama, the utterances of the chorus are simply a reflection of current popular opinion. The 'slaves,' indeed, may be said to represent the mental attitude of the 'plain man,' or, in other words, of the people whom Jesus is addressing. The dialogue, then, is to be viewed as our Lord's deliberate forestalling of certain criticism of His work which sooner or later will arise.

'When the blade grew up and bore fruit, then appeared also the tares' (v.[26]). This is the opportunity for the chorus to ask whence came the tares. But the manner of their query is significant. 'Was it not good seed that you sowed in your field? Whence, then, the tares?' The tone is either of sheer bewilderment or of covert mockery. In either case it speaks lack of confidence, and represents a challenge. Only one sower was known to have worked in the field, and he the owner. If darnel was now growing, who else could have sown it? It is a curiously inverted parallel to the suggestion of Beelzebub casting out demons. They do not inquire why a man should sow tares among his own wheat, but they are content to insinuate that it is so. The master does not argue the matter. He answers categorically and at once: 'My enemy is the man who has done this.' For him there is no mystery. He knows who has stood to him as *αὐτοῦ ὁ ἐχθρός* (v.[25]).

At this point the slaves raise their second question: In that case, do you want us to go and gather them out of hand? It is the evident course. The master himself would not have sown the darnel. Only a man at cross purposes with him would do that. The helpful thing will be to undo the evil work. Once again they are rebuffed. The darnel shall be allowed to grow to maturity, rather than any of the good wheat be in danger of being trodden down or rooted up. Ingathering there shall be in due course, but not yet; and when the harvest is ready, the reapers shall be expert, competent men, not clumsy amateurs.

It is clear that the moral drawn by Jesus for His disciples is not the dominating thought of the Parable as originally told. There is here very little stress laid on the final discrimination. It is asserted, and will bear all the emphasis that our Lord places upon it afterwards. But the chief concern of Jesus as He tells the story is with the points of view set forth in the dialogue. He explains later that the 'good seed' here stands for the 'sons of the Kingdom,' the society of His believers as drawn together by Himself. The society is now at its small beginnings, but it is growing, and it will grow in the open daylight for all the world to see. He looks forward a little, to the time when voices will be raised in question, like the voices in the story. Unworthy men will be seen in His society, and people will say: 'It was a good society you established, was it not? Then how do you account for these?' He knew it was coming, for even then Judas Iscariot was one of the Twelve, and whether He knew at this time or not that Judas would betray Him, He was well able to assess the moral worth of so unsatisfactory a man. And as time went on the world would take note of many inconsistencies—a Cæsar Borgia, an Inquisition and much insincerity in great things and in small—and they would ask, looking at the Founder, how these things came into the society. He has one answer: This is the seed of the enemy. The Master refuses to accept responsibility for these; they are not degenerates, they are aliens of another stock.

This stern disavowal, however, is followed by what seems to the plain observer a pure contradiction. The zealous secular critic is clearly warned against trying to root out the offences. The master is content to see the hostile growths continue and flourish, rather than have his good wheat, even the poorest of it, beaten down.

Here we seem to touch the heart of our Lord's meaning. All the terrible doom He speaks of for the tares is only secondary in His mind. 'The Kingdom of Heaven is like a man who sowed good seed.' The darnel is an incident, though a serious one. The object of main concern is the wheat.

The teaching is remarkable. It is noteworthy that the mind of Christ dwells most on the good, while the tendency of men is to emphasize the evil. It seems that Jesus did not expect that the evil which would inevitably find a place in His society would vitally corrupt it. As in another connexion 'where sin abounded, grace' would 'much more abound.'

The difference between good and evil is very clear in His mind, and is one of origin. If evil is found among the good, it is because it is connected with an evil source. For this reason it is condemned; the fruit shares the doom of the tree. But nothing can be radically evil which has sprung from a good source. Whatever He has sown will in some degree partake of the nature of its origin. It may be woefully poor in quality, but even the poorest wheat is better than darnel, and the man who has been 'born anew' into the Kingdom of Heaven is essentially different from one who has not, whether found within the society of believers or outside. Our Lord fully recognized the possibility of really wicked men being within the Church. He did not scruple to call Judas 'a devil,' nor the hypocritical religionists of His day 'children of the devil.' Such wickedness is directly traceable to the Spirit of Evil, and so long as kinship with that Spirit is maintained the doom of the sire is the doom of the sons. The Son of God does not acknowledge such reprobates as belonging to Him. They are not of His sowing, but are like the weedy, poisonous darnel, enjoying its natural exuberance, but actually harmful instead of serviceable. Spiritual kinship is ever voluntary. If one may use the phrase in this connexion, there is an 'eternal generation,' a perpetual renewal of kinship, in regard to evil as to good. Only those who by constant deliberate choices renew that relation are spiritual sons, and their sonship holds when and in so far as they maintain community of purpose. The Spirit of Evil is incurably opposed to the Good, and any man who chooses wholly to embody that Spirit inevitably shares in the eternal judgment which it incurs. But only comparatively rarely does a man so whole-heartedly embrace Evil that he is entirely beyond the influence of Good.

For this reason our Lord, while He has a very serious word about the fate of the persistent evildoer, shows immediate concern for that greater part of men who have not said, 'Evil, be thou my good.' There is indeed a risk, as the zealous slaves perceived, that some of the darnel might, from its similarity to wheat, be allowed by mistake to go into the barn. The Master, however, sees a far greater risk—that some of the wheat, so thin as to resemble tares, should be destroyed in error. Not all the wheat is of the hundredfold order; some is sixty, some only thirty, and some even less. Nor are all Christians of the same excellence, but in the eyes of the Master even the least satisfactory of His planting is too precious to be lost. In due course He will commission His own reapers to gather up all that is valuable, and they will make no mistake. So God at the last will pass infallible and inexorable judgment on good and bad, but utter destruction awaits only those who persistently choose evil as their portion.

The special contribution which Jesus makes in this Parable is His appeal for the deferring of judgment. The final discrimination is safe in the hands of God; He will not allow evil to go unpunished, nor will He be unjust to those who are weak rather than vicious. Certainly the average man is no fair judge in the case. Jesus seems to have in mind not so much the physical purging of the Church of its unworthy members as the act of passing judgment. For this the 'plain man' is not competent. He will go over the field rooting up this, and this, noting one thing after another of unworthy growth in the Church. Such growths there will undoubtedly be, but there is danger lest he find more than there are. Examining unsympathetically, he will conclude that the whole life of the Church is poisoned, and his collection of tares will serve effectually to depreciate the wheat. Yet the wheat is good, although not uniform. The man who thus finds the Church discredited will never enter its fellowship, or learn its music, because of the taint by which he believes it to be dishonoured.

But after all, the honour of the Church is not in his keeping; he is not called upon to judge. Judgment belongs to God. He will finally gather the tares to burn them. Now that is precisely what the casual observer cannot do. He cannot utterly destroy the evil of which he disapproves. He can collect his tares, his instances of unworthiness, and exhibit them as damning evidence against the Church. But God does not regard them in that light. When He gathers them, the things that cause stumbling, it is to make an end of them, and the Church of His faithful ones, now purified, will be welcomed home.

Our Lord's purpose, then, in telling this Parable to the multitude is to make clear for them an aspect of the Kingdom which will cause much surprise and some misgiving. It will not be perfected without conflict, and the conflict will be carried on within the Church itself. Nothing that

He says of the Kingdom is in any way discounted by this fact. The struggle of Good against Evil is inherent in all moral progress. The challenging presence of evil does not detract from true goodness. The society of His believers is seed of His own planting, having in it the very life of His Spirit. Every single member, therefore, is to Him of invaluable preciousness, to be most carefully preserved from loss. To His disciples He emphasizes the fact that a certain award of eternal punishment is laid up for Evil, but for the multitude He lingers on His care for those who are His own. That these may have the fullest opportunity for development, the Master will endure to be hindered and misrepresented. But let the man who holds aloof refrain from judging lest he trample the weak and lowly with the cunning and deceitful. Jesus would say that the place for the man who sincerely desired to work for the Kingdom was within its fellowship, provided he was content to pay the price.

Entre Nous.

IMMORTALITY.

Harry Emerson Fosdick.

No month passes without some book which makes its contribution to the problem of Immortality. It is a subject which teases at all men's minds. A man must wonder whether or no he can say 'I also believe.' But lately the subject seems to be even more prominent than usual. Perhaps the emphasis on it is a necessary corollary of the present emphasis on life and works. We find that we cannot see properly the ordinary facts of life except against the background of immortality. Four books have come to our hand within the last few days—one of which is dealt with in the 'Notes of Recent Exposition.' Dr. Fosdick in delivering the Ingersoll Lecture for 1927, now published in this country by Mr. Humphrey Milford with the title *Spiritual Values and Eternal Life* (pp. 26; 4s. 6d. net), says: 'My belief in life eternal springs out of the haunting faith which Ralph Waldo Emerson puts into words characteristically compressed:

What is excellent,
As God lives, is permanent.'

It is from the spiritual values which man experiences and creates here that Dr. Fosdick argues to eternal life. 'Upon a planet that once was uninhabited and that some day will be uninhabitable, the dominance of death means not simply the final end of individuals, but the final end of those spiritual values which we have known here, which inhere in individuals and their relationships, and which have seemed to us the supremely precious fruits of the creative process.'

It will be seen from this quotation that he has no happy confidence in the fulfilment of men's spiritual values in this planet. He accepts the more modern scientific position that a time will come when 'the glory of the sun will be dimmed, and the earth, tideless and inert, will not longer tolerate the race which has for a moment disturbed its solitude.' What then? There must be a continuance of spiritual values. And this postulates the existence of personalities to express them.

'Pierre Loti in one of his stories describes the death of his hero, a French soldier in Africa. The man is mortally wounded with an Arab knife, and is left to die alone. Loti describes with pitiless detail the sensations of his dying: . . . until at last comes the end—a body left to be devoured by hyenas, jackals, and vultures, and a naked skull turned over and over by the desert winds. And that is all! Is it all? If it is, then some day upon a played-out planet all humanity will be dead, and of a race that once loved timeless values nothing will be left but naked skulls rolled by cosmic winds across a desert. It is that *dénouement* which I do not believe.

'Obviously, in this realm no compelling demonstration that will force assent is possible, and no dogmatism is intellectually credible. There is adventurous risk in man's living and dying.

It may be that the gulfs will wash us down;
It may be we shall touch the Happy Isles.

For myself, however, confidence in personality's victory over the grave is deep, and, as the years pass, it grows more assured. Charles Kingsley's attitude toward death seems wise and true: "God forgive me if I am wrong, but I look forward to it with an intense and reverent curiosity." To enter

here and now into the world of spiritual values so that truth, goodness, beauty, and love are one's very being, its substance and its glory—that is the present possession of eternal life. And to have faith that these spiritual values are no casual by-product of a negligent universe, but, rather, the very essence of the real world, and that death has no dominion over them or their possessors—that is faith in immortality.'

Hastings Rashdall.

Twenty-six of the sermons and addresses of the late Dean of Carlisle have been collected by Dr. H. D. A. Major, and published in attractive form by Mr. Basil Blackwell. The title is *Principles and Precepts* (6s. net). One of the sermons is on the text 'Our Saviour Christ Jesus, who abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.' After tracing the process of thought by which the Jewish mind was brought to the conviction of immortality, he goes on: 'At bottom the argument is the same as that which still appeals to us. The only God that is conceivable to the modern mind, once enlightened by the teaching of Christ, is a God of Justice and a God of Love: and if there be such a God, it is inconceivable that He should have created man merely for so poor and so unsatisfactory a life as this life is for a large proportion of those who live it. If there be a God of Love, His love cannot cease with death; if there be a God of Justice, there must be some closer correspondence between happiness and goodness than is discoverable here on earth.

'The belief in immortality is, then, a direct consequence or corollary of our belief in God.'

Towards the end of his address, Dr. Rashdall makes a point which is not unlike that of Dr. Fosdick. 'It is precisely on account of the higher capacities of human nature,' he says, 'its capacities for something higher and better and more permanent than this life affords, that we cannot persuade ourselves that the wages of virtue are dust. It is the best men whom we cannot believe that God will willingly let die.'

His last point is that it is in Christ that the Christian's hope of immortality centres, and this even apart from the testimony of the Apostles in their vision of the risen Lord. 'Not only by His teaching, not only by the brief visions which followed His departure, but also because He has raised our ideal of humanity to its highest point, it is true that it is Christ, above all others, who has brought life and immortality to light.'

William E. Barton.

Safed the Sage is an even more familiar name to us than William E. Barton. For it is under this name that the Rev. W. E. Barton contributes to that very alive periodical 'Public Opinion' a short weekly study in which he says many wise and enduring things in his own delightful way, and endears to us the figure round which most of the parables are woven—the little granddaughter, 'the daughter of the daughter of Keturah.' It is with real sorrow that we learn that on the very day on which the final touches were put to the manuscript of *My Faith in Immortality* 'the wife of his youth, well beloved for forty happy years,' passed from this life. *My Faith in Immortality* (Sampson Low; 3s. 6d. net) is not a book for the scholar, although its foundations rest on sound scholarship. It is a book for every man. In it we seem to hear Dr. Barton saying, 'Come and let us talk over together what science has to say about immortality, and philosophy, and the Old Testament and the New Testament. Do you believe in communion with the dead? Do you believe in hell and in heaven? Discuss these things frankly with me and I will tell you those beliefs which have led me to faith in immortal life.'

In an early chapter he writes: 'What concerns and profoundly impresses me is, that in a world where death is universal, a belief in life after death is almost, if not quite, universal also. That fact, whatever its explanation, is one of profound significance. Indeed, I shall go further, and shall say that *faith in immortality is even more astonishing than the fact of immortality.*

'Let me illustrate that statement. Suppose I had power to transform a frog into a bird, and wished to prepare the frog in some degree for what I was about to do. It is easy to imagine how I could perform the transformation, granted I had the power which the illustration assumes; but how could I possibly make the frog understand, being a frog?

'Is the illustration grotesque? Let it be so, if it makes clear my meaning. It is much easier for me to imagine myself touching a frog with a wand and telling him to fly, and seeing him rise on newly created wings, than it is to conceive of any method by which I could educate him in froghood for the high privileges of birdhood.

'Now if there be a wise and good and Almighty Father in Heaven, it is certainly possible for Him to grant eternal life to His children; but how can it have been possible for Him ever to have given to them the faintest glimmering of such a future?

It seems so utterly inconceivable that one is tempted to declare it impossible. But just before we do this, we encounter the fact that men very generally, and in all conditions of society and civilization, have received in some way an intimation of immortality.'

For the words 'I believe in the resurrection of the body' Dr. Barton prefers 'I believe in the survival of personal identity,' and with regard to the survival of the physical body, he finds an illustration helpful. 'It is not quite true that the body which we now have is identical in its parts with what constituted the body of the unborn child. In the embryonic period it was only a part of his body, and in the early stages of life, a minor part. The other part enveloped it, and gave it life. . . . But they were soon separated, and the part that had been so useful was discarded immediately as being no longer of use. . . . I think of this present wonderful body of ours as a kind of placenta for the spiritual organism that shall relate itself to our spiritual life and express our spiritual nature in the world to come. I do not despise these beautiful bodies of ours, but I like to think that our spiritual life is capable of developing for its expression an organism as well adapted to its future existence as this one is to our present existence. This present body is but the placenta of the spiritual organism that is to be.'

In the chapter on hell, Dr. Barton corrects once more—it cannot be done too often—the wrong ideas which have centred round the word 'hell' through misunderstanding of Jesus' figure of speech on that occasion when he used Jerusalem's city dump to illustrate God's method of dealing with refractory material. 'This figurative use of Jerusalem's dump has done much to define the popular idea of hell, and its very name, "Gehenna," is preserved in the translation: for "Sheol" in the Old Testament and "hades" in the New, ought never to be translated "hell." Let us recall for a moment the Jerusalem garbage pile, and the method of sewage disposal.

'The undying worm and the unquenchable fire are not symbols of torture, but of conservation. They are the symbols of the utilization of waste. The worm does not die, not because any one maggot is miraculously endowed with immortality, but because the dump waggons are continually carting in more material for worms to feed upon and to lay eggs in. It is not because any one worm continues to gnaw, or because any one carcass survives to be gnawed.

'The fire is not quenched because more fuel is continuously added. It is not because any one scrap of waste paper continues for ever to burn. So far as the Jerusalem dump is concerned, when fuel ceases to be carted there will be no more devouring worm, and no more unquenchable fire.

'Meantime, the unquenched fire takes filth and makes of it clean ashes, good fertilizer, or even if leeched, good antiseptic. And the worm, ugly as he is to look at, converts garbage into something less repulsive. Then a bird flies over the valley and eats the worm; and the carrion becomes a carol; the stench is transformed into a song. Even the worm and the fire are God's beneficent agents for turning the elements of destruction into products of constructive value to the world. They are not the symbols of despair, but of God's apparently thwarted but ultimately triumphant hope.'

Dr. Barton is a master of helpful analogies. In the following one he signifies his faith in heaven.

'I was once riding on a Pullman train and with me, among other passengers, rode a mother and a little girl of five. The little girl and I got acquainted. . . . As we travelled we approached a town and I said, "This is our last stop. Here we shall slip the dining-car, and here, perhaps, we shall change engines. We run home in two hours and twenty minutes."

'She said, "I don't care if this old train never gets me home."

'I inquired of her why she held her destination in such low esteem, and she told me that it was because she would be required to learn "very hard letters."

'With a little investigation I learned these further facts: She had just started to go to school in the middle of September, and had attended not more than three weeks when her mother for business reasons had to remove her home. The little girl had heard her mother say that she was sorry to leave just then, as the little girl had just got nicely started in school, and now would have to begin all over again. The little girl understood this to mean that she would encounter in her new school an entirely new alphabet, and she dreaded the "very hard letters." . . .

'I told the little girl that I had journeyed through her town a hundred times, and that I had reliable information that she would not need to learn any new alphabet. I told her that the same twenty-six letters were employed there, and that the spelling was identical. I told her that very few people spelled c-o-w with a "k"; that it was not con-

sidered good form; and that d-o-g and c-a-t were spelled exactly as they were elsewhere.

'I succeeded in convincing her, and the information comforted her. She grew more interested in the approach of the end of the journey, and I think she appreciated my great knowledge of the state of education in various parts.

'It is in some such way I like to think of the relations of this life to that which is to come. Our education here is just begun, and we find ourselves caught up out of this kindergarten of the soul and taken to where it seems everything will be strange and we shall have to begin all over again. I wonder if our Heavenly Father has not some experienced angels who have nothing better to do than to meet us somewhere near the terminus, and tell us better.

'Kind deeds, and loving words, and helpful acts, and noble aspirations, and worthy resolves, and heroic faith, and struggles to overcome temptation, and desires to serve others, are the alphabet, the primary forms, out of which, I am confident, all the words in the unabridged dictionary of the language of heaven are to be spelled.'

SOME TEXTS.

'Now he that wrought us for this very thing is God' (2 Co 5⁵, R.V.).

'"Now he that wrought us for this very thing is God." Have you discovered that man has before him a high destiny? St. Paul answers that it could not be otherwise. God hath wrought us, he declares, for a mighty and triumphant purpose; a purpose disclosed in our present possession of the Spirit of God, by whom the work now in progress is to become complete. Hear these exalted words of his concerning the Godlike character to which we are ordained, and the glorious immortality to which we are bidden to aspire. "Now he that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the spirit."

'One day there came a village pastor to see the exhibits of a big exhibition, and having a bent for mechanics, and some experience and skill, he soon sought the machinery; and, wondering that machines so many and varied should be running with power from a single source, he found his way to the engine room.

'And what do you think he said when he saw the great engine?

'He said, "I made it!" No; he was not insane, or deceiving. And the discovery was as complete a surprise to him as to those who heard him.

'He examined the massive giant from end to end; there was no doubt about it; it was his very own. He had crept through its bulky boilers before they had a single flue; he had crawled beneath them when they were first set up; he had witnessed and superintended the casting of every part; he had overseen the adjustment of every bolt and valve and rod; it was his own!

'As a boy he had been bred a mechanic, and had become a skilled engineer. His firm established a branch house, and put him in charge of it. The greatest single work of the branch under his administration was the building of a powerful engine for a modern mill. Trusted with the responsibility of so important a work, he spared no effort to do it superbly well; and when the engine was ready to be set up he built the engine into its place. In time he took a course in theology and entered the ministry. Meanwhile, a fire had occurred and had destroyed the mill apparently with all its plant. That chapter of his experience seemed to have left no memorial; it was, except to himself, as if it had not been. But when the debris of the fire had been cleared away, the fine engine was found but little injured. And so when the now pastor visited the exhibition he found his own engine which he supposed had perished; found it still strong and steady, and doing a bewildering variety of work far beyond the dreams of the man who made it.

'After the road of life comes to what seems to us its abrupt termination; after the wreck and disaster of what we call death; the motive power of our present life will abide, indestructible. And I think we shall stand in heaven bewildered with wondering joy when we discover that the structure of life's mechanism is adapted to almost infinitely varied and celestial uses. We shall say with Paul, "Now he that wrought us for this very thing is God."'[1]

'On him they laid the cross' (Lk 23²⁶).

'The story of Simon of Cyrene is a parable of all those who, through no considered plan of their own, find themselves in the course of life bearing in body, mind, and heart that crucifixion through which alone the world is won to a better way of life.

1. 'Some bear the cross upon their *backs*.' 'A few months ago I was on a destroyer in the Suez Canal when a big P. & O. liner drew up to the coaling station. Barges were lashed alongside and great beams laid up as bridges to doors in the ship's hull. Soon black naked figures with eighty-pound

[1] W. E. Barton, *My Faith in Immortality*, 49.

baskets on their heads were hurrying along these beams and dumping loads of coal into the hatches. They were lean Arabs from the Nile Delta, black ghosts of half-starved fellahin, unknown, unvalued, save as beasts of burden. They were as straws in the wind, the dust of the earth. The rail above the coaling operation was lined with people. On the edge of the barge stood a sheik in a white burnoose with a knotted rope in his hand. If one of the carriers slowed up, the sheik hit him with the rope across the naked back. One could see the purple welt and the flesh swell beneath the lash. For hours the labour continued silently, save for the rush of coal into the ship and the Arabic curses of this Egyptian Simon Legree.

'Up above men and women set their teeth in anger and horror. The sheer inhumanity of the spectacle aroused them to the position of labour in that part of the world, and they were equipped to reveal the degradation of such methods. Upon the backs of unknown and unvalued Arabs was laid a cross, upon which their people had been stretched for centuries, and the world was beginning to see and to understand.'

2. 'Others bear the cross upon their *minds*. One thinks of Keir Hardie in England, and Walter Rauschenbusch in the United States, among the first to state the social implications of the teaching of Jesus for modern life. These men had placed upon their minds the almost intolerable burden of illuminating reactionary and stand-pat people until those who control our social order should comprehend the meaning of brotherhood and compassion. Their words have gone out through all the earth to serve as a ferment and a stimulus, to arouse a profound discontent with the kind of world in which we now live and think.'

3. 'Still others bear the cross upon their *hearts*. Carl Sandburg, in his new biography *Abraham Lincoln, The Prairie Years*, gives an account of Lincoln's 1858 address at Chicago in a gruelling campaign for the young rail-splitter from the Illinois prairie, who was just emerging from the obscurity of county politics. The day was a dark one, defeat and humiliation seemed certain, and Lincoln—after speaking of the treachery of supposed friends—mentioned that he and his associates had been "bespattered with every imaginable odious epithet." The redemption of men and women and children was being borne, twelve years before the Civil War broke out, by a great-hearted man of the people.

'Not only do people enter emotionally into the experience of Simon of Cyrene in the great affairs of life, but also in the almost daily Calvaries which come in homes, in offices, and in every line of employment. Stefan Zweig has pictured the solidarity of the family and the suffering of one for the other in his play, *Jeremiah*. Every one except the prophet's mother thinks him a mad, raving maniac. She comes to the outcast and discredited man: "My child, were you indeed the rejected of all men, banned by the priests, outlawed by the people; had God Himself thrust you away from the light of His countenance; still were you my son, blood of my blood for evermore. I will love you for their hatred, and bless you for their curse. If they have spit upon you, come that I may kiss you; if they have cast you out, come that I may take you in; *home*, come home to my heart. Sweet to me is the salt of your tears, blessed is all that you do; if only you return to my mother's heart." The divine compassion is like that—it goes forth to all sufferers and says: "Sweet to me is the bitterness of your lips, sweet to me the salt of your tears. All that men despise in you, that you are worth to me."

'Some bear the cross on their bodies, like the Arabs at Suez, others bear it upon their minds like Hardie and Rauschenbusch, some upon their hearts like Jeremiah.'

These thoughts are from a sermon in *The Crucifixion in our Street*, a volume by the Rev. George Stewart, which has been published in America by the George Doran Company, and now in this country by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (6s. net). The central thought in the volume is the Cross, and each of the twelve studies deals with a different aspect. It will be noticed that this volume of sermons was published in America in the first instance. There are volumes of sermons which come from America which do not seem to suit the English mind, and the reason is often that they contain so many illustrations that there is no room left for sustained thought. This volume is full of illustrations and yet it does suit us, and this not only because the illustrations are unhackneyed, but chiefly because they seem to be Mr. Stewart's natural method of expressing his thought. These sermons will be found excellent reading and full of suggestion for addresses for the less formal occasions.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen. Scotland.

DEMCO

FOR REFERENCE

Do Not Take From This Room

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY